

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

1.962
70249

70249

LECTURES AND DISCUSSIONS FROM SCHOOL of PHILOSOPHY for WASHINGTON EMPLOYEES



SPONSORED BY
FOREST SERVICE CLERICAL
TRAINING COMMITTEE
UNDER DIRECTION OF
PROGRAM STUDY AND
DISCUSSION DIVISION
BUREAU of AGRICULTURAL
ECONOMICS

OCTOBER 1-2-3, 1941

FOREST SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT of AGRICULTURE

LECTURES AND DISCUSSIONS

From

SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY

For

WASHINGTON EMPLOYEES

Sponsored By

FOREST SERVICE CLERICAL TRAINING COMMITTEE

Under Direction of

PROGRAM STUDY AND DISCUSSION DIVISION

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

FOREST SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

October 1, 2, 3, 1941

LECTURES AND DISCUSSIONS FROM SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY
FOR WASHINGTON EMPLOYEES

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Foreword.....	IV
"My Day"	V
Program.....	VI
The Speakers.....	IX
Purpose of School of Philosophy.....	1
October 1 - Subject: Understanding Our Department's Place in the Social Structure and Our Place in the Department.....	1
Opening Statement.....	1
How can philosophy help the employee in this understanding - Dr. Taeusch.....	2
The changing social, economic, and political background in which the Department must operate, and to which the employee must adjust himself - Dr. Ross.....	13
The immediate situation facing the employee, its limitations and its opportunities - Dr. Meriam.....	17
Comments.....	25
Discussions.....	27
October 2 - Subject: The Place of Democracy in Society and within the Government Organization.....	29
Democracy, its broad meaning and its function in the social structure - Father Walsh.....	29
The place of democracy in the Department structure; what does this offer to the Government employee; to what extent should he renounce freedom of thought and speech and action? - Dr. Smith.....	40
The Department Program: What the employee should know about it - Assistant Secretary Hill.....	52

	<u>Page</u>
Comments.....	56
Discussions.....	57
October 3 - Subject: Adjustments.....	59
Orienting the Forest Service program with the democratic, economic background presented - Dr. Clapp	59
Has democracy a universal, workable philosophy of human relationships in a complex world? - Mrs. Roosevelt.....	66
Developing a personal employee life philosophy - Dr. Ross.....	71
Comments.....	73
Discussions.....	74

FOREWORD

Because of a demand from the field, and also from practically all who participated in the School, the Committee has assembled the lectures, and some other related material, for publication. No transcripts were made of discussions. To give an idea as to the trend they took, and the breadth of interest they expressed, a number, but by no means all, of the questions are included, together with comments by the Committee and its advisor on discussion content or conclusions reached on some of them. Remember there were ten groups for three days, 30 discussions in all, so complete coverage is impossible.

One Region has proposed to organize similar discussion groups among its own members using the printed instead of the spoken lecture as the base. This has important possibilities and no doubt others will do likewise.

In addition the Forest Service wishes here to express again its appreciation of the splendid cooperation of the Program Studies and Discussion Division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which made the School possible, and of Dr. Tacusch personally, who contributed so much to its success.

The publication of these lectures and comments should not be construed as an indorsement by the Forest Service of ideas and opinions expressed. All of the material herein expresses opinions of individuals or groups of individuals, some of whom are employees. The Forest Service indorses the right of employees to have and to express personal opinions, when so labeled, but it does not necessarily indorse those opinions.

Lehmanide
Assistant Chief, Forest Service

The Clerical Training Committee

Mary E. Price
Edna H. Lane
Mary B. Hughes
Estelle C. Fairbrother
Gloria Jaems
Ruth Patterson
Elizabeth P. Puryear

P. Kepplinger
Peter Kepplinger, Advisor

From "My Day"

A WORKABLE PHILOSOPHY

Friday morning I went for a brief time to address the School of Philosophy, which is a group of employes in the Forest Service who gather to discuss their own work and to understand better some of the objectives of the department. They assigned me quite a subject: "Has Democracy a Universal, Workable Philosophy of Human Relationship to a Complex World?" I only hope I was able to contribute something to their course.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Forest Service and Agricultural Economics

SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY FOR WASHINGTON EMPLOYEES

To be held at Washington, D. C., October, 1, 2, and 3, 1941
Department of Agriculture Auditorium

Program

General Topic: Understanding Our Department's Place in the Social Structure and Our Place in the Department.

Morning Session

First Day: Background

9:00-9:45 1. How can philosophy help the employee in this understanding? Dr. Carl F. Taeusch, B.A.E.

10:00-10:45 2. The changing social, economic, and political background in which the Department must operate, and to which the employee must adjust himself. Dr. E. A. Ross
University of Wisconsin

11:00-11:45 3. The immediate situation facing the employee, its limitations and its opportunities. Dr. Lewis Meriam
Brookings Institute

Afternoon Session

1:15 to 2:40 Discussions

2:45 to 3:15 Reassembly in auditorium

The following questions have been suggested for discussion. All participants are urged to submit questions, preferably in writing, to their group leader.

1. How will the changes mentioned by Dr. Ross affect the Department or the Forest Service with reference to specific problems. For example: Forest conservation? Forest ownership? Control of privately owned natural resources? Free public services such as free recreation facilities in forests? Free hunting and fishing on federal land? Free use of timber from National Forests by settlers? Other services furnished by Agriculture.

2. Psychologists tell us that the human being craves above all else the opportunity for self expression. In the situation discussed by Dr. Meriam, - (a) Does the average clerical employee have an opportunity normally for self expression in her work relations? (b) What kind of opportunities should they have? Without sacrificing efficiency, is it possible to broaden opportunity? In a period of change, should the employee endeavor to change herself?

Morning Session

Second Day: The Place of Democracy in Society and within the Government Organization.

9:00-9:45 1. Democracy, its broad meaning and its function in the social structure.
Father Walsh
Georgetown University

10:00-10:45 2. The place of democracy in the Department structure; what does this offer to the Government employee; to what extent should he renounce freedom of thought and speech and action?
Dr. T. V. Smith
University of Chicago

11:00-11:45 3. The Department Program: What the employee should know about it.
Secretary Wickard

Afternoon Session

1:15 to 2:40 Discussions

2:45 to 3:15 Reassembly in auditorium

Suggested Questions:

1. Do the "four freedoms" apply to federal employees? Although "democracy" is our ideal, are not federal departments still governed autocratically? Are personal liberties more restricted in the Government than in private industry? Can the unfavorable attitude of the public toward Government employees be changed?

2. The Secretary has set a goal, an objective for the Department. What can the individual clerical or other employee contribute toward advancing the Department program?

Morning Session

Third Day: Adjustments.

9:30-10:15 1. Has democracy a universal, workable philosophy of human relationships in a complex world?

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

10:30-11:15 2. Orienting the Forest Service program with the democratic, economic background presented.

Mr. Earle H. Clapp
Acting Chief, Forest Service

11:30-12:15 3. Developing a personal employee life philosophy.

Dr. E. A. Ross
University of Wisconsin

Afternoon Session

1:15 to 2:40 Discussions

2:45 to 3:15 Reassembly in auditorium

Suggested questions:

1. Accepting as a fact that the Forest Service (or other Bureau) is doing a worthwhile service to its Department and to Society, then how can the individual worker assure herself that her particular work is worthwhile?

2. The Forest Service in the beginning was recognized as an organization of crusaders. On what did the crusading spirit depend? How was it developed? How can it be developed again in the Forest Service or elsewhere?

3. How to develop a philosophy that will equip the individual to accept and perform work of minor rank with enthusiasm and with certain feeling that he is fulfilling an important role? Such a philosophy is paramount if that employee is to be happy and satisfied.

Discussion Leaders, afternoon sessions: Daniel M. Braum, Robert D. Hubbard, Robert B. Ellis, Mrs. M. B. Williams, H. A. Wilkinson, A. G. Peterson, Udo Rall, W. E. Allen, Roy E. Miller, Frank Lombard, John R. Camp, Glen Mitchell, Elizabeth P. Puryear, Perkins Coville, Lyall Peterson, Don Clark, Ken Davis, Charles Tebbe, A. E. Schneider.

Sponsoring Committee: Gloria Joerns, May B. Hughes, Elizabeth P. Puryear, Mary E. Price, Ruth Patterson, Edna H. Lane, Estelle Fairbrother.

All lectures are being mechanically recorded through the courtesy of the Sanbran Company of Washington.

THE SPEAKERS

Carl F. Taeusch: educator, philosopher, author; faculty member of Harvard and Chicago Universities; former acting editor International Journal of Ethics and managing editor of Harvard Business Review; now head of the Division of Program Study and Discussion, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

Edward E. Ross: author, lecturer, sociologist, economist; faculty member of Wisconsin University; now advisory editor of American Journal of Sociologists and professor of Sociology at University of Wisconsin.

Lewis Meriam: author, lecturer; one time staff member of Bureau of Census, Shipping Board, composing committee of Classification Act of 1923; now advisor to Joint Senate and House Committees and the President's Emergency Committee for Employment, and staff member of Brookings Institution.

Father Walsh: educator, clergyman; representative of Government and religious organizations in United States, Europe, and Far East; now regent of School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University as well as vice-president of that University.

T. V. Smith: educator, philosopher, statesman; former member of Illinois State Legislature and House of Representatives of United States Congress; now professor of philosophy at Chicago University.

Grover B. Hill: public administrator in the career service; former member of staff of A.A.A., present Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Earle H. Clapp: forester; associate of Mr. Gifford Pinchot in early conservation work; former Assistant Chief of the Forest Service in charge of Forest Research; later Associate Chief of the Forest Service; now Acting Chief of the Forest Service.

Eleanor Roosevelt (Mrs.): social worker, columnist, lecturer; public spirited citizen; wife of the President of the United States.

SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY

Purpose: The purpose of the School is to attempt, through the philosophical approach, to develop a method and an attitude of mind (philosophy) that will enable the employee to give better service to her unit, and at the same time get greater personal satisfaction from her work.

October 1

Subject: Understanding Our Department's Place in the Social Structure and our Place in the Department.

Lectures

(Note: In fairness to the speakers it should be understood that the recording was not perfect. Dr. Meriam's talk has not been edited, while the record for Dr. Ross's talk was so poor that he substituted a similar lecture given at another School).

OPENING STATEMENT: - Miss Joerns: Last winter, eight girls in the Forest Service were appointed to serve on a training committee for the clerical force. The committee, with the help of Mr. Keplinger, discussed the problems confronting the employees and attempted to find how best to present to them the training they wanted, or needed. After consulting and analyzing employee opinion we discerned one outstanding desire on the part of the majority and that was to know this: How does the Department's program fit into the national situation, and what has my job to do with that program? We believe that this School of Philosophy which is being given in cooperation with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is one method to finding the answer to this question. We do not hope for a complete answer, but we do hope that by drawing from the experience and knowledge of the speakers and from all of you in the discussions we will be able to see more clearly the role the Agriculture employee plays. Our immediate aim in holding this school is to try to bring to all the realization that every job whether clerical, administrative, or technical is vital to the organization, and that the organization is vital in the life of our country. To better serve you in the guidance of this meeting we have asked an experienced and sympathetic member of the Forest Service, Mr. Perry A. Thompson, Chief of the Division of Personnel Management, to be our Chairman. Mr. Thompson.

(Over)

How Can Philosophy Help the Employee
in this Understanding — Dr. Taeusch

I am very happy indeed to be able to initiate a school we've all all looked forward to with great pleasure. Somehow or other the Forest Service stirs the heartstrings of people in the Department. We have met with sections of the field staff of the Forest Service in various parts of the country, and now we are happy indeed to meet the Washington group.

Now as Mr. Thompson has so very capably pointed out, this program is yours. When Mr. Keplinger first approached us on this whole matter, he stated that he didn't want to mention any particular thing that he wanted on the program, and he didn't want us to do so; that he had a working committee which was at the time figuring on subjects and on speakers.

When we met with that committee, we found out that these folks had ideas about what they did want. And as this program evolved, it resulted in a pattern which I think is fairly close to what this committee — your committee if you please, had in mind. And I know that, in the correspondence with the speakers we were requested to secure, this idea that this program was evolved by your committee was the crucial thing not only that secured some of our speakers for us but also that enabled them to construct the outlines of their talks in a way that they tell me has proved a source of great gratification.

Now, I don't know of any better definition of the general subject that I want to introduce here than that spirit. The subject has been assigned to me, "How can philosophy help the employee in his understanding of the social structure and the place of the Forest Service in our department?" If I know the Department employees and those of the Forest Service, my guess is that anyone who works in the Department of Agriculture or in the Forest Service has to have a philosophy; that you must have some kind of a philosophical attitude or you couldn't live through it.

Now what is this philosophy that we're supposed to discuss this week? I'm going to give you a statement that was made with reference to the so-called German philosophers, but I think it applies to all philosophers, as an introduction to what we mean by philosophy. The statement has been made that the philosopher can dive deeper, stay under longer and come up muddier than anybody else on the face of the globe. Now while we can enjoy that remark, I want you to notice something about that description of philosophers. They can dive deeper — which is space; they can stay under longer — which is time; and they can come up muddier — and that's matter. And any scientist will tell you that when you get space, time, and matter settled, you've got practically the whole of the universe.

I shall call attention to one further point in this definition. If the philosopher does dive deeper than anybody else, it's because the sea happens to be pretty deep; and if he stays under longer, it's simply that he's down there to see what is going on; and if he comes up muddier, it's because there's mud down there.

Now with that illustration, let me say that what we attempt to do in the field of philosophy is to see life and see it whole. And the three cardinal sins in the field of philosophy are these: (1) Inadequacy of view: if you don't see the whole thing in perspective, you can't call yourself a philosopher. (2) Inaccuracy of observation, and let me stress that: sometimes in our good natured controversies with the scientists, the scientists will point out that the philosopher is up in the clouds but that the scientist attends to fact. As a matter of fact, the accuracy of observation of fact is one of the cardinal principles in philosophy, and the inaccuracy of the reporting of what one sees is one of the cardinal sins in philosophy. In other words, science is a part of philosophy. (3) The third cardinal sin is a failure to see the connections between things. Now if we turn that thing around and if you say, "Well, when I got by myself and sit back, and let the world and the details roll off me, I've got a pretty adequate perspective of things. I think I've looked over the ground pretty well. I think I see things clearly and I think I see connections." Well then, whether you have ever had a systematic course of philosophy in your education or not, you are a philosopher.

And so we approach this School and the reason this name Philosophy, I think, has stuck to the Schools. For years we didn't even use the term in connection with them. But as these meetings progressed, as we got together in the afternoons in small groups to talk over what had been presented in the morning, what happened was that everybody began to break through certain obsessions that they had, they began to throw their own prejudices into a common cauldron, perfectly willing to examine them objectively and let other people look at them, gave up some prejudices that had been pretty well nourished up to that time, and in the give and take began to have a broader perspective even of the humble jobs that you and I have to do in the Department. And that's probably why the "nickname", if you please (for that's what it is), "the Schools of Philosophy" happened to be applied to this thing that has been happening for the last half dozen years.

I've often likened it to a situation on our academic campuses where the construction of a new building, quite often mistakenly to my notion, is accompanied by the early construction of sidewalks. To my notion, the building should be constructed and then the paths should be allowed to be made by the students, and then the sidewalks should be put where the paths are formed.

Now if you want to know why these meetings (and there are now over a hundred of them) have been called "schools of philosophy", its simply because people have called them that and disregarded the technical term that we gave to them.

Well now, with that breaking of the ice, I want to leave this rather self-conscious discussion of what philosophy is, to approach at least for a moment the philosophical point of view. In some ways this approach is pretty uncomfortable, and a part of that discomfort is the fact that we have been going along, pretty well isolated from troubles, fairly well off

economically, taking a lot of things for granted that we haven't done much thinking about, until suddenly we are confronted with a situation which has thrown us back upon ourselves and our thinking and we have begun to wonder about a great many of these things that we've taken for granted; and one of these things is Democracy.

I suppose that most of us took that for granted. A lot of it is in our system and in our behavior that has never reached the point of the thought processes let alone the speech. Our daily activities have expressed our democracy whether we're always fully conscious of it or not. But here is this thing that has been happening across the water that has done to us exactly what every obstacle always does to the human mind. That is, the human mind goes along largely as a result of habit formation, of memories, of prejudices and the like, until it strikes an obstacle that it cannot solve even by an assembling of these memories and prejudices; and then for the first time for a long time the human mind begins to think. It begins to think its way around this obstacle, and our minds bristle with all sorts of solutions. And among the half dozen or more alternative modes of behavior or alternative modes of thought, we may find one to get around this obstacle, or to meet it. One of those solutions probably prevails, and then we go ahead on a mode of behavior that persists again until a time when some obstacle again calls that path of procedure into question.

Now here is this thing that has suddenly come before us. We have been confronted with a statement to the effect that democracy might be very well, but that it leads to a situation in which thirteen million people can't find employment (not only aren't employed, but can't find employment); whereas an alternative system avowedly hostile to democracy can solve that problem, and the statement is made, that there is something radically wrong with democracy. We are met with a statement for example, that there is something inherently inefficient about democracy, and that what the world needs in government is an efficient form of government, of social order. Now I am not going to go into this problem of efficiency. I think it can be challenged. I think in the long run it can be demonstrated that democracy is far more efficient than anything else that we have so far seen in economic, social, and governmental organization and function. But I am not going to take time to develop that idea. What I want to do is to develop two ideas in democracy that I think we pay entirely too little attention to. And I hope in both cases to bring these factors to your attention in such a way that you may see that here are factors in democracy, highly important to be considered, which apply directly to the daily tasks even of the most humble of us. The first of these factors that I want to call attention to is the place of the minority in a democratic social system. And the second thing I want to call attention to is the place of administration in a democratic organization.

When we ask people, "What to your mind constitutes democracy?", usually the first reaction we get is, "majority rule." The second reaction usually is, "every man equal to every other man," or "individual rights," or something of that type. Now, as a matter of fact, those are two things in democracy that we have taken for granted so long, because for over a

hundred and fifty years we have even had them written down in our basic organ of government as the essential principles of our government. All through and through we're impressed with the idea that the majority rules at election time. We do it even in the Supreme Court. We do it in our meetings, under Robert's Rules of Order. We've got it in our system, and that we take for granted. We also in our Bill of Rights, have written down explicitly what every individual has a right to insist upon, so far as the majority is concerned, so far as the government is concerned: that he can conserve his individuality, even to the extent that he may carry that demand to the highest tribunal of the land. But there is one thing that is not written down in our constitution so explicitly, it is there only by implication, and that is the role of the minorities in this democratic form of government.

Now what is that role? To begin with, it means that every minority may constitute itself as a group, with the freedom to pursue its purposes as it sees fit so long as it keeps within the rules of law and order of the land. What does that mean? That means that practically every individual in this democracy of ours, whether he belongs to the majority that has its will in the active government on Capitol Hill, every individual can become a constitutive member of a group that represents his interests even better than that majority which has been elected; and as we look over the social pattern in America we are bound to admit that practically every one of us belongs to one or more minority groups that cannot possibly constitute a majority.

Now think it over. Take the political groups themselves. The individual may be among those who voted against the present administration. We may, locally, for example, be in the minority, and we maintain that feeling of communion with other members of that minority with the idea that some day probably our idea will prevail. Religiously, there isn't a single person that belongs to any church organization that constitutes a majority group. Every church and religious organization in this country constitutes a minority in the social pattern. Racially, practically every one of us stems from a group which, so far as the population in this country is concerned, is a minority. And the likelihood is that so far as social ideas are concerned, or anything else that would constitute a group in which there is a common mode of thought, there is involved a minority situation. Even in politics you have the situation where although a majority vote has been cast, the reasons for those votes may have been so different as to constitute minority groups of the majority group. And we have a government and a social attitude which tolerates those minority groups.

In this land we have the privilege and we assert the right definitely as individuals, to belong to such groups not only as may pursue purposes which no government can pursue, or which the majority fails to pursue, but even in the field of criticism, reflective thinking on what is going on, we have the right to belong to groups which protest against the majority rule, which criticize the government in power. Now that is our privilege. Now see by way of contrast what happens abroad. Yes, they have had voting and they have had majorities, at least nominal majorities; but when that voting is over, what is done is to stamp out the minority groups that have voted

in that election, to stamp out any social group, labor union, employers association, church groups, anything at all that varies from this so-called will of the majority that has been put into power. Now, by way of contrast, that tolerance of the minority group has become the essence of our democracy; and when we glibly point to the fact that democracy means the majority rule and individual rights, the likelihood is that we have also become as accustomed to this minority situation that we don't think about it. We don't regard that as probably one of the principles of our social order; not written in the Constitution, but a part of what we call our social mores, the sort of thing that keeps our society together. And those of you who have had the privilege of traveling about in the country, into parts of the South or Southwest, or seeing for example, or listening to the type of thinking that goes on in the Southeast, or up into the Pacific Northwest, or get into the Scandinavian region of Minnesota and the Dakotas, come into regions where racial or religious sects dominate in a certain form of social pattern that makes that particular community unique, you will recognize the fact that our democracy -- sometimes referred to as 100% American -- as a matter of fact is constituted of a welter of minority patterns, each developing ^{these} individual according to his own purposes. But the resultant of forces presents a variegated picture of society that is richer than anything that one can find in the much-vaunted, efficient, totalitarian governments.

You may say, "Yes, that is all very well, but how does that effect me?" It affects you and me very definitely. If you will look at the program, let me call your attention to a very significant item. One of the subjects to be discussed tomorrow is "The Place of Democracy in the Department Structure. What does this Offer to the Government Employee and to what Extent Should he Renounce Freedom of Thought and Speech and Action?" Why, there is a subject that bristles with dynamite. But I think it is one of the glories of the Department of Agriculture that we can discuss this problem and let the minority have its say. In the development of these schools, if we don't have on our program someone who is avowedly opposed to the present administration, or who writes us, "You made a mistake, because I am very critical of this Department of Agriculture;" if we don't have someone on our program that has that attitude, we go out of our way to get someone of that type.

I recall a couple of years ago when Secretary Wallace was asking where we would be going next, I said, "To Arizona." "Well that is interesting, who is going to be on the program?" Well I did have to hum and haw a little bit, but said, "I'll tell you, one of the men you will be interested in is Commissioner McDonald of Texas, who had been viciously attacking the Department program for cotton." "Fine, fine," said the Secretary. And the very thing happened that always happens when democracy is working properly; for when Commissioner McDonald had had his say, and the county agents had talked the thing over with him, they came to me afterward and said, "Now here we were all excited about this new thing, we thought there was a great deal more to it than what we actually found out there was, and we are satisfied that this particular scheme is not worth support." Now that is the democratic mode of procedure. But there is one other element that I want to point out in this minority situation that must be remembered. And that is

that, aside from the right of a minority, as exhibited by the fact that it may protest, that it may oppose, that it may organize, within the general fabric of course of our social or legal order; there is also an accompanying obligation on the part of the minority, namely, to accept the decision of the majority. Again look abroad and see what happens. In fact we don't have to look across the Atlantic Ocean. We can even see in this hemisphere, that there are occasions in which, after an election has been held, and a decision made (ostensibly fairly), the minority has refused to accept that decision and has resorted to bullets instead of their ineffective ballots; and we have the spectacle in recent years of minority groups refusing to accept the decision of the majority and persisting with other than legal political methods until they finally secure control of the government by force.

Now the vicious thing about that situation is this: That a hundred years ago when democracies were beginning to feel their way, there was a physical basis for the construction of a democracy, following or accompanying a revolution. That was that, if a democracy consisted of a majority vote, it in those days could be sustained and sanctioned by the fact that that majority was also a preponderance of gun power. But today, with the development of mechanical equipment, especially the machine gun, it is possible for a minority to gain control of a government and by the monopoly of martial weapons maintain that control in spite of the fact that it has the majority against it.

Have you ever wondered how it is that we in this country have escaped that situation? We have a written constitution; but there is nothing in there that states, for example, that people should accept the decision of the majority. We have a Supreme Court that has been operating on this basis now as long as the government has been standing. How does it happen that a Supreme Court can go ahead with a division of opinion, with sarcastic and bitter criticisms of each other, even in the published decisions, and yet when those decisions are made they are accepted, even though physically sometimes the minority probably could best the majority of the Court? Why is it that when we play or watch a game of football, or baseball, we accept the outcome? We go home from the football game, or we used to when we were in school, and we may console ourselves with the fact that we had a lower score than the other fellow, by pointing out how much more yardage we gained and all of that. But notice what was the attitude of mind apparent among every person that had been at a spectacle of that sort: "Wait till next year." Not that we were going to cancel the results of that football game, not that we were going to disqualify the umpire especially in the middle of the game, not that we were all going to rush out because it happened to be our home team that was beaten, and just simply overrun the other fellow. Oh no. We accepted that decision and we went home with the promise of the prospects of next year.

This attitude is a part of our national mores. It is not written in a document, and it is not supported by physical force. But at present, in our American society, there is an attitude which sustains that particular position of self restraint on the part of the minority to accept the decision of the majority, and it is one of the most stabilizing factors in our government.

That means, that freedom to criticize in our offices, when we are by ourselves or with our best friends, where we can tear the boss to pieces, if we please, and we do. Oh don't worry. I know what goes on. It is a part of the privilege of an Army. That is one thing that makes the British Army so great - the privilege of grousing. "For seven days not a bit of preserves, and when it came it was cherry instead of strawberry." We've all got that privilege. The wise officer will let that thing go on. That's our safety valve. And it's pathetic to think that there are so many people in the world today, that can't understand that very elemental factor of good sportsmanship in society.

But with all our grousing, with all our complaints about what the boss does - if that thing went on without restraint don't you see what we would have? Anarchy. What do we do? Even grumble inside sometimes. We don't talk it outside about the way things are going. But in our behavior, we recognize that there's got to be organization, there's got to be authority, and we have the promise that if there is a change in the administration of the government at large, or of our particular bureau or of our particular division, then our ideas will prevail.

As for good sportsmanship, I don't think it is solely a matter of words; I think it is written deeper into our behavior. Good sportsmanship requires, in the interests of the welfare of the whole society, that when once it becomes clear that a majority, or general consensus, is different from ours, we've got to play the soldier there too and abide by the decision.

In that attitude of the minority there is more power in a democracy than there is in the physical force sustaining the majority. True, back of every law in the remote corners of our civil society stands the sheriff and his posse. But that isn't what constitutes our society. Our society rests in the last analysis upon the acceptance by the minorities that have been beaten, by those of us as individuals who don't have our way in our offices. In simple terms, that is the factor of democracy that I think we most lose sight of.

Now I want to turn to one other factor, again that we take for granted, and that is administration. I see Professor Smith back there -- he's probably laughing here at some things I may be saying. I went as an instructor in philosophy to the University of Chicago to do my first college teaching and I was known at Harvard as being a pragmatist. Now a pragmatist is a person who thinks that beauty is as beauty does; that truth is that which works. And when on several occasions some of my professors protested with me about the way in which I did my thinking, they told me that William James has been dead for 20 years. Well, I didn't say anything, because I was in the minority, but I thought to myself. "You poor college professors, William James is stalking around all over this place." And of course I was very much attracted with the offer from Chicago, because that was not only known as a center of pragmatism, it was known as a hotbed of pragmatism. And when I got there, I overheard my chief say that the one reason he got me was because I was not a pragmatist. And I'm telling you right now that for the first year there I was one of the darndest idealists you ever saw. I opposed those pragmatists

all the way through, but that was just temporary policy. I think probably most of us in America are pragmatists. It is one of the most characteristic philosophies that the country has ever produced. It was worked out on the frontier among men who probably didn't even know what the word philosophy meant. Because pragmatism holds that truth is the thing that works. And out of that frontier experience which still pervades this country we have developed, not so much even in our thought processes as in our behavior, this pragmatic form of philosophy.

Now what does that mean in the case of government? I think we have slipped a little bit in government, so that we are too much idealists in government. And perhaps you can agree with me if I point out a few convincing factors. We get all wrought up every four years in a presidential campaign. And we get wrought up over a party platform, or a program, if you please, which is a sort of a pattern of future procedure, and we talk about those objectives, and our argument is directed almost exclusively toward those objectives. We give very little thought to how those things are actually going to be worked out. We think that if we put a law on the statute books we have solved our problems. In other words we revert to that situation developed in the Bible where the sins of a lot of people, supposedly, were cast off into a herd of swine and the swine were driven into the Gadarene Lake and that was the last of them. They got rid of their sins that way, and we do too! And we are doing that in our governmental attitudes today. If we can just get a law on the subject we think that social problem is solved. We did it in the days of prohibition. Even our hard-boiled business men had the idea that, if they could just come to Congress and let Congress pass a law, that thing would be solved.

We happen to be members of the Department of Agriculture which is not in the legislative branch of the government. We are in the executive branch of the government. We are in the branch that executes the law. Some people use the term "administer the laws." But this term administration is just a little bit broader than execution of the law. Administrative functions involve policy formation as well as a blind and literal interpretation and execution of the law. Now the founders of this government did think that our executive officials had the function of taking a law, reading it, trying to understand it and applying it to the local situation. Alexander Hamilton thought that that would make the United States not a uniform government such as some people were afraid of, but a government that would apply to all parts in an adaptation to local circumstances. He said the judgment of our administrative officers would translate that uniform law into a situation that fitted that local community. Now we all know that that just did not happen. What has actually happened has been that legislation, so far as our ideas of government are concerned, so far as they have actually worked out, has pretty well controlled governmental activity since the beginning of this Nation. It's only been within the recent eight or ten years that attention has been focused more and more on administration. And we have come to recognize it, and it is possible to see that in the Department of Agriculture. I think they must see it in other Departments, but we see it in the Department of Agriculture as we go about the country and meet with the field officers of this Department.

We see that, however good that law may be, if it is poorly administered or poorly executed, anywhere down to the local offices, there is trouble in the local community. And we have seen the reverse of that, that many a law has become a good law, whatever it may have been to begin with, because it has been intelligently administered. A law may be a good pattern of society, but that pattern doesn't mean anything except insofar as it functions in the local community in the hands of a local administrator. And that means that so far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, the legislation which governs our behavior can be made or broken by the good judgment and the good sense with which we as administrative officers carry out that law and interpret it. Oh yes, Congress listens to the officers of the Department of Agriculture, and we have a part in the formulation of policy; but the thing that I am pointing out to you is that we also have a part in the execution of the law because the human mind, in its attempt to interpret a document that is supposedly perfectly clear so far as the English language is concerned, comes out at various angles in the actual execution.

You may say, yes that's all well and good, this thing about leaders in Mr. Thompson's suggestions. It's all right to accept the leaders, but what about us? Oh that same principle applies to every person in the rank and file of the Department. Just one point. I have been at the receiving end of letters from the Department of Agriculture. I have seen people say, "Now isn't that interesting. There's that great big Department of Agriculture and they just hit the nail right on the head. That's just what I wanted." But I have heard farm people say, of letters, "There is another one, and into the wastebasket it goes because those folks in Washington didn't understand what I asked about." And I have been in communities and I have been in farm homes where that question was important. It wasn't important solely with regard to that individual family; it was a crucial point. Sometimes just a little shade of difference in the phrasing of a letter makes all the difference in the world as to what constitutes Agricultural policy.

We have had the experience in the Department of having people who are in charge of ordering mimeograph paper, control the policy of the Department, because what was going on that mimeograph paper didn't happen to suit the fellow that was going to order the paper. That's bureaucracy. In other words, bureaucracy consists of the control of policy by a technical officer overstepping his bounds. Now what I am trying to get at here is that all the pyrotechnics of our presidential campaigns, all the textbooks on political science and on government have dealt so much with such things, for example, as the functions of the Supreme Court and the policies that are elaborated by Congress and the like, until recently there has been entirely too little attention paid to the plain fact that in the last analysis the basic check of the soundness of public policy, of the adequacy of legislation, consists in the ability and the judgment of the individual administrator to carry that out. And among those administrators you'd be surprised who all constitutes the crucial point. If sometimes you get a bit discouraged about the humble place that you happen to occupy in this great organization, let me warn you to remember that one mistake that you may make will overcome a hundred good deeds that you may do in the spirit of loyalty to your department. And that quite frequently the particular product that you turn out, in whatever humble

capacity you may yourself be pursuing - the particular product that you turn out is the one tangible bit of evidence that the fellow who gets it has in regard to what the government is doing. And I come back to a point that I raised at the very beginning, that one of the things in philosophy is to have adequacy of perspective, and revert back 2000 years to an old philosopher by the name of Aristotle, who in two words expressed this point (which to my notion is crucial): "neglect nothing." And a whole realm of science is built upon the proposition that mere accidents in the field of science - mere accidental qualities, may as a matter of fact if carefully examined, be the crucial differentia that constitute the keynote to the discovery of that scientific principle. And it holds in administration just as well as it holds in the field of science.

If, as I say, you get discouraged at times about the fact that you are a speck in the Universe, just remember that the greatest instrument the mathematician has today, the integral and differential calculus is based upon an implication from a quantity so small that nothing can be conceded smaller than that. And if sometime you folks feel like derivatives, just remember, you will remember if you have had your calculus, that the integration of these insignificant derivatives is the thing that constitutes the totality.

We have occasion, in getting over the country, of meeting with all conditions and sorts of people. I am quite often amazed at the attitude they take. We stopped one time, a county agent and I, on a peanut farm. We saw this farmer up on the hill looking over the crop, went up and talked to him and found out that he was a weather observer. He had been doing that for 37 years. First time he had ever met anyone from the Department of Agriculture, and this is the thing that he said. "You know, I've been sending in those reports for 37 years and I pity the fellows in there that have got to fumble around over those reports and try to get something out of them." Oh yes, you hear the other kind of thing also about the government if you please; you hear the other thing too. But we have been to places, for example, where people don't differentiate between the Department of Agriculture -- take the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Forest Service. They don't know any difference between those two, or the Department of Agriculture and Department of Labor. Why, you are both the Government aren't you? And we are blamed for everything that the Secretary of Labor does. We, in other words, soon learn that we could not disavow any responsibility for this thing that is being carried on by asserting that we happen to be in this particular water-tight compartment, and don't have any responsibility for what happens over there.

Now as a matter of fact this field of administration, which is so new that there is practically no science of it as yet (it is just recently that we have begun to have some magazines on the subjects, quarterlies and the like) is the thing that you are a part of. And insofar as you do your job - I hope I'm not preaching here, because I mean it in a very real sense - insofar as you do your job well, the Forest Service will take care of itself. And insofar as the Forest Service will do its job, we don't have to worry about the Department of Agriculture. And if you've had the

delightful experience that I have had of going out into the byways and remote recesses of the country to discover that people have a profound respect and admiration for the Department of Agriculture, you will have that glow of feeling that you are a part of that accomplishment, regardless of the small amount of contribution you may have made to it. And therefore if I am to close and again refer to the topic that I am supposed to develop here, if you want to be a philosopher, and I have yet to see a person who deep in his heart didn't want to be a real philosopher, if you want to be a philosopher - be tolerant of the other fellow's point of view and demand it of him. If you are whipped in a decision that is made, accept it in the spirit of "wait till next year when our turn comes." And if you want to be a philosopher, remember that you are in an administrative branch of the government in which it doesn't make a particle of difference what the headliners on Capitol Hill may pass as legislation - that law is what you do. In other words, if you ever saw the play called "Lightnin'" you will get the spirit of the thing that I am talking about. Lightnin' was an old Civil War veteran and he showed his friends his pension check. He says, "You see there, you see that name down there?" Yes, well what is it? The Secretary of the Treasury. "See that name there?" Treasurer of the United States. "That check," said Lightnin', "ain't worth a damn till I sign it."

The Changing Social, Economic, and Political Background
in which the Department Must Operate, and to which the
Employee Must Adjust Himself. Dr. Ross

Realization of the rapid deterioration of our natural wealth -- soils, forests -- is bound to magnify the importance of the State. Conservation will be brought about partly by the spread of more enlightened attitudes and practices among farmers, graziers and sportsmen; but always government will be obliged to wield some authority over soil use and to tackle numerous jobs it wasn't even aware of fifty years ago. Other developments of our time adding to the responsibility of the State are:

1. Vast investments in highways since transport became motorized.
2. Huge flood control and power-development works -- T.V.A.
3. The progress of pathology and medicine magnifies the role of government in the safeguarding of the public health.
4. Constantly more is exacted along the line of public enlightenment -- maintenance of schools, vocational training, agricultural extension, University extension, public libraries, etc. So far as we can see ahead this burden on government will become heavier.
5. Inevitably, the creation and maintenance of public parks and playgrounds will be saddled upon it; for their role in conserving the health and morale of the people -- and particularly of children and youth -- is ever more clearly understood and there is in view no other agency than the State that can be looked to to provide facilities for public recreation.

So the idea that the lot of the toiling masses will be better in case the authority and the responsibilities of the State are whittled down -- which under the name of "philosophical anarchism" had quite a vogue among European free thinkers and "leftists" 50-60 years ago -- has been so discredited as the new roles of government in caring for certain social interests come to be appreciated by intellectuals that the anarchist movement has all but died out.

In pointing to the developments in the last half century which are unmistakably dilating the importance of the State to the welfare of society I am not making myself a champion of the totalitarian state nor intimating that all capital is to be publicly owned.

Population pressure. One thing, you can be quite sure of it, is that the strain upon -- and consequent wasteful using up -- of natural resources -- is not going to disappear of itself owing to reduction of population pressure. You hear a lot about "birth control" and, from the amount of publicity it receives, are led to imagine that the "pressure of numbers upon the means of subsistence" is speedily being "liquidated". Nobody takes pains to call to your attention the fact that "death control" is quite as sensational in effects as birth control and is spreading through humanity at a far quicker pace than birth control is. Perhaps three times as large a proportion of mankind have the one as have the other. The latter runs into the decisive

resistance on the part of many peoples. It is the women who have by far the keener interest in keeping down the number of births. The men don't have to meet the ordeal of parturition, so they look upon additional children from hardly any other than the economic point of view. When they can have their child's services at a tender age and are not required to send the child to school for more than three or four years when its labor is of no account, most fathers see no objection to the large family. When women are too bullied and repressed to dream of taking their own part, even when spokesmen for religion sternly warn them that to bear children is what God put them here for, so that any form of contraception is a grave sin and will subject them to Divine punishment, or when husbands pay little heed to the wishes of their wives as regards enlarging the size of the family; then the fecundity is not going to be brought down much by birth control.

But death control meets with an altogether different greeting. It encounters no resistance from any quarter, everybody is for it. If Europeans wish to reconcile natives to the loss of their tribal or national self-determination, they woo their gratitude by introducing them to some of the benefits of modern medicine, taking measures to stay pestilences of yellow fever, bubonic, typhoid, etc., and setting up clinics and hospitals to alleviate when they cannot cure. The natives are of course delighted and grateful and have no idea of what this saving of lives will presently let them in for in the way of populations pressure. With death control everywhere welcome to cut down deaths, while birth control is allowed to operate freely in only a few of the more advanced peoples, it is not surprising that many more peoples are expanding than are stationary or decreasing. In Africa it has been found that every area assigned exclusively for native occupancy and expansion, no matter how generous it appeared to be at the time of assigning, is in a few years filled up tight and the clamor for more land from which the surplus numbers may feed themselves becomes very hard to resist since the only alternative is starvation on a great scale. For the whites incessantly to recede and withdraw before the natives affords the native people no relief in the long run for the expansive power of the blacks after you "crack down" on the raids and inter-tribal wars. Nature's remedies for unendurable increase of numbers, is such that they will rapidly breed themselves into a state of wretchedness if given the boon of death control before they are advanced enough culturally to avail themselves of birth control.

A people can get along after a fashion with neither death control or birth control; which was the experience of virtually all sections of mankind down to about a century ago. It can get along with both death control and birth control provided the latter is employed with judgment. But birth control without death control is likely to start a people toward shrinkage, with extinction as a possible windup, while death control without birth control will quickly make any people a menace to itself and to its neighbors.

The Conflict between the Interests of the Living and those of Posterity

Since conservation policies call for some sacrifice of the interests of the living for the sake of future generations, we have to ask ourselves "How will the present generation respond to such a demand?"

As we look into the history of agriculture we see plainly that the most soil-conserving farm practices grew up when each family felt identified with a particular holding and the subdivision and eventual disappearance of this holding among a plurality of heirs was prevented by handing down the farm on the principle of primogeniture.

I cannot see soil-conserving types of farm practice coming into American agriculture along these lines. The mobility of American life being what it is and short-term tenancy expanding all the time, there is small prospect of the average farmer's thinking of the prosperity of his children and his grandchildren being bound up with the productivity of the old home place.

Nor can subdividing and loss of identity of this place be averted by reviving the old principle of primogeniture associated as it is in our farmers' minds with the European principle of aristocracy. No, the wide adoption of soil-conserving policies here will not depend upon the typical farm family coming to identify its future with the future of a particular home place which is expected to remain in the family for generations and assure its perpetuity.

It will come by other routes. One is that the more intelligent, respected, and influential farmers in the locality will incorporate soil-conserving ways into their mode of tillage and presently most of the others will fall in behind them rather than be rated as poor and slovenly farmers. I do not expect, however, that tenants will be much affected by their rating in the eyes of their farm-owning neighbors. In order to extract their rental and a living they will continue to mine the land, justifying themselves with the reflection, "Needs must when the devil drives!"

Another motive which might prompt our people to support drastic soil-conserving policies is solicitude for the national future rather than for the family future. Let me warn you against the big mistake of imagining that there is no limit to the American public's sympathy with the chap who is "on the make". All of us from childhood on have been taught to dream that this country has a radiant future and is destined to play one day a much greater role than even she does now. Once you show the average American the rate at which the dissipation of key natural resources is going on and make clear to him the dismal plight of our great grandchildren will find themselves in if radical measures are not taken now, the vigor of his reactions will prove, I am sure, startling. Whatever it may cost, he will be found determined that the U.S.A. shall not turn out to have been a "false dawn". Once the scientists contrive to get their cause before the common people it will be found that the public stand ready to embrace and adopt very radical and far-reaching policies for which no precedent can be found in our past. Just here is one of the advantages of a government "by and for the people". It will, amid general approval, be clothed with the authority to do strange and very drastic things when there is no suspicion that the power-holding classes are behind the new and startling policy "with an axe of their own to grind."

Nothing appeals to conscience and the chivalric impulses like a political issue when it takes the form: "The interests of the living versus the interests of the unborn." Everyone realizes that the unborn are not here to plead their cause or cast their ballots, so the battle turns on how the living divide on the question. This means that the greedy and selfish will be on one side while the noble and conscientious will be on the opposite side. This being the case, the cause of conserving the valuable elements in the nation's natural environment may win a wider popular support than most would deem possible. It may take geologists, geographers, foresters and soil experts to establish the significance of what is going on; but once the sinister trends of current practices have been set beyond all possibility of a doubt, the response of the public may prove more statesman-like than most of us had expected. The ordinary person may feel just as deep a concern as the sage for the welfare of posterity once it has been made clear to him just how our present courses of action are endangering it.

It is like the issue Adults vs. Children. The Children have no say; the matter is threshed out among adults. But experience has shown that many adults of very ordinary outlook prove just as zealous as the child experts themselves in standing up for the cause of the children once they have been enlightened as to what is really at stake.

So far the conservation movement has not been adulterated -- and hence compromised -- by any inmixture of selfish private interests. Hence the thoughtful are confronted by a very clear case of Interests vs. Disinterests; Present vs. Future; Living vs. the Unborn; Short View vs. Long View. This is just the kind of a line-up that appeals to them for they like to vindicate their social worth by massing on the side opposed to the Shallow, Short-sighted, or Selfish.

The Immediate Situation Facing the Employee,
its Limitations and its Opportunities -- Dr. Meriam.

Civil servants of the people of the United States: Your committee has specified to me a general field in which I am to talk. They have specified it very ably and I hope that I shall be able to come somewhere near those specifications. The first point that I want to make is a perfectly obvious one, I think. For years and years the opportunity of the individual to work by himself, make his own living in that way, has become increasingly scarce, and more and more we have had to work in groups - in groups where each of us has to play his part.

I always regret a little that as far as I know, girls have no game which is exactly comparable to a game of football where there are certain plays arranged in advance and, when the signal is given for that play, each person on that team has a certain definite task to play. And the success of that play depends on how each one of those people carry out their part. Maybe one spectacular person runs with the ball, but the success of that person depends very largely on what the other people do. That is the kind of work which most of us find in the Government service. It isn't a chance for us to do something by ourselves. It's a chance for us to play a part in a team enterprise.

The other fact that I want to bring out at this time is that there is no indication that the importance of Government service is diminishing. It is quite the contrary. As we look forward it seems inescapable that the importance of government should greatly increase in the years before us, and the success of our country and our civilization is going to turn more and more on what the government does.

One of the topics that I have been asked to discuss is the attitude toward government employees, and I am going to reverse it to the attitude of government employees toward Congress and the public; what, if anything, we can do about it. Now the first thing to remember is for us to understand the public. I speak of us as government employees because I still think of myself as a government employee. It is very much easier for us to understand the public than it is for the public to understand us. Now the first thing we know about the public is that they have to pay for the services of public employees. It is very unfortunate that probably the first government in the United States is the local government. The people are closest to this government and they understand perfectly well they are paying for it. So that many employees are regarded as just patronage people with no competence for their jobs and no efficiency. We are paying for it; we have paid for that sort of thing. Some of you may have read some of Leonard White's attempts to measure the prestige of government employees, and you will find that it is the employees in local government who are regarded lowest by the people whose opinions were sought and I am glad to say that those studies show that there is considerable appreciation of the prestige attached to the employees of the federal service.

Now one of the ways of overcoming that feeling that many people have toward the government employees is by giving good, sound service to the people. This morning that fact was emphasized. I had an illustration of it just a day or two ago. One government department had issued a very important report. I happened to know the man who wrote that report and knew that some months before he had left that department. He was somewhere around Washington but I did not know exactly where, so the easiest way to find out was to call that department and ask where he was. Well, the first thing that telephone operator told me was that he was not with us anymore, and she was about to hang up, I said, "Hold on a minute" - and then I told her why I wanted to see him, what it was and how important it was that I get in touch with him because there was nobody else in that organization who could answer the question which I wanted to ask, because it was a little deeper than he had gone in the report. Now, the first impression I got when that girl wanted to get rid of me just as fast as she could made me feel as if the place wasn't what it should be. Now I know that there is a tendency to say, "Well, we have got to cut these people short, we can't waste our time on everybody who comes along" but it's that kind of an attitude, we are not going to waste our time on anybody that comes along, is the thing that makes a lot of people rather peevish with the government service.

Now another thing that we have to remember is that we live in one of the highest-cost communities in the United States. We always must remember that as far as the departmental service is concerned it operates under the apportionate law. We bring people here from far and near. We have no system under which some of our clerical employees can live at home and subsist on the wages which are prevalent in many sections of the country where people - girls particularly - doing office work, live at home and get along on a small amount of money. It is a very common thing out through the country to find people talking about salaries which are paid to government workers, as if those salaries were outrageous; whereas as a matter of fact, we know they are not much higher at the bottom than is necessary for a decent standard of living. I am rather glad that the situation with respect to the high cost of living in Washington is becoming so well known that some people are declining to come to Washington for the defense activities. In a way that's a very wholesome development.

Now I am going to talk a little bit about the attitude of Congress toward the government employees. There is no such thing as a Congressional attitude toward the government employees. There are hundreds of Congressmen and there seems to be a very wide variation in the attitude toward government employees. There are certain Congressmen who seem to trade on that sentiment that there is back home. They can get a response by talking about the government employees as if they were feeders at the trough and didn't do any work. There are a great many Congressmen who have a keen interest and a profound knowledge of what the situation is with respect to government employees. We are very much misled, it seems to me, in things along that line if you consider the action which Congress takes at any particular moment. Now I came into the Service in 1905, and I followed it fairly closely ever since. And it seems to me that there are very few fields in which over the years we have made more advance than we have in the field of the government's relations with its employees. I am not going into the whole history of the Classification Act; I am not going into the history of the Retirement Act; but we have seen those two

Acts placed on the statute books. We have seen consideration given to the government employees who are in travel status, and I hope we are going to see some adequate adjustment made with respect to what, in the days of the old Reclassification Commission, we called "advancement within the grade." There are possibilities that that is going to be worked out. Not necessarily worked out perfectly. There are administrative difficulties to be overcome. That is true of so many of our things - they're not perfect. There are defects in administration, but after all it gets better and over the 25 years you will find that there is very material improvement.

I am very much disturbed to find some government employees, some fairly high administrative officers, that express profound contempt for the Congress as a whole, as an institution. After all, Congress is representative of the people that we serve. Other nations have got rid of their Congresses, of their parliaments, which is one of the moves in the direction of the Dictatorships. I think we're doing a great disservice to the country insofar as we broadly condemn Congress. It seems to me that Congress serves a very real function. People in the administrative service develop programs, and if we didn't have any Congress to which to present them we wouldn't get that reaction of how this is going to appeal to the people. Time and time again I've seen the program gradually worked out. I'm going to give you one illustration: I was working with Mr. Lehlbach one time and I took the opportunity to talk over with him what I regarded as a very bad feature of our retirement legislation as it was originally passed, and the gross injustice that it seemed to me to do to the people who are in the upper wage brackets. Mr. Lehlbach agreed with me perfectly, yet he was a major author of the bill in the House, which is still the Lehlbach Retirement Bill, but he pointed out to me that he couldn't get that over in Congress at this time. The sentiment against that was too great, there were too many people opposed to it, and then he turned to me and said, "Meriam, you know, we'll be working on this Act for the next 15 or 20 years, amending it, developing and perfecting it. But it's got to be done over a period of years, it can't be done all at once."

There is one thing that's been very encouraging to me along a slightly different line. I'm going to illustrate that by telling you about the time I was sent down by the office to North Carolina to help the Salary and Wage Commission of North Carolina. The Governor, Governor McLain, had been up here as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Salary and Wage Commission was Sam Rogers. Sam Rogers had been Director of the Census - Director of the Census after I'd resigned. I'd been down there two or three times when he was Director on conferences and met him, but didn't know him at all well. Angus McLain told me that the ablest group of men with whom he had worked were the government employees in the Treasury Department. Never in private business had he encountered such fine type, able employees. And once he was fussing about some stenographic work, and I didn't blame him much for fussing about it, it was pretty terrible, and he said, "You know, you can't get the kind of stenographers down here that we could get in the federal government service."

Now, if you'll read the testimony of various officials who've been connected with the Departments and retired, I don't recall any case in which

the official has been bitter against the government employees. The testimony is almost invariably very strongly in their favor, though far enough back, before the time of the Retirement Act, you'll find sometimes criticism regarding the number of incompetent people who held on. Secretary Lane, before we had the Retirement Act decided he was going to do something about that - it was before we had the Retirement Act - and he made several dismissals of people who had been with the Department for years and years and broken down. Unfortunately each one of those employees on dismissal committed suicide, and the Secretary at that time was a very strong convert in favor of the deductions of the Retirement system.

Now, I think the attitude that we should take toward the people who the Department serves is clear enough. I'm going to tell one story that Julia Lathrop told one time at a conference on Indian administration that we had at Atlantic City. She was talking about the training that the employee should have to go into the Indian Service. And then she said there should be a course on manners. Then she told a story of her experience in Chicago. There was one family that had a feeble-minded child. The mother was very devoted to that feeble-minded child but the presence of that feeble-minded child in the home was doing great damage to the family and there was no good that could possibly result from it, and the best thing to do, it seemed, was to have that child placed in an institution for the feeble minded. It was only with very great difficulty that Miss Lathrop and the other social workers were able to persuade the mother of that child to agree to that form of care. But finally the mother agreed. And Miss Lathrop telephoned to the superintendent of the institution and he sent a representative to get the child. A little while later Miss Lathrop was called in. The mother wouldn't let the child go so Miss Lathrop went to the house to see what it was, and the mother said, "We couldn't, we couldn't possibly let our child go to a place where they had men like that." And a little further inquiry showed that the man displayed no tact, no manners, rough, brutal - in manner - not necessarily in spirit - but in manner. The result was that Miss Lathrop had to go over the whole business again of getting the family ready to accept. The superintendent of the institution was very much disturbed.

He emphasized the importance of the manner of the employees in dealing with these people; you not only have to have the essence there, but you have to have the manner and the contact. Well, at that time the mother called Miss Lathrop to say, "Such a charming, lovely gentleman came from the institution that I was glad to let my daughter go." Now, we all have that question of manner involved and it is extremely important in our relationship with the public.

I just want to mention briefly the tie-up of government employees with unions. I'm not opposed at all to the government employees being organized, the government employees having a group method of presenting their views to the administration with respect to those things in which the administration has a part in group presentation of the point of view of the employees to Congress. That's been going on now for a great many years. There was at one time sentiment against it, but a law was passed which gave the employees the right to organize.

I'm not at all convinced that the relationship of a union to the government as an employer has any parallel at all with the relationship of a union to a private business enterprise. The relation of supervisor, division chief, bureau chief, secretary to the employees in the government departments has very little parallel with the relationship of top management to workers in an industrial system. There are lots of grievances, lots of things that the administrative offices of the Department are powerless to do anything about because they don't make the laws, and the matter with respect to hours, salaries, leave, are in the main and have for many, many years been determined by Congress, and what an administrative officer can do with respect to many things, even if he isn't bound by law, is governed in no small measure by the amount of the appropriations which are available to him to use.

I don't know whether conditions have changed tremendously since I was in the Service. Maybe they have, but it seemed to me in those offices in which I worked that the relationship between the upper supervisory employees and the other employees was more or less like that of people who were on the same team. I didn't find when I was first starting out in an appointment at \$900 in the Census Bureau that the Director was trying in any way to exploit me, or that he was trying in any way to exploit the other employees. As a matter of fact the attitude of Director North toward that class of young men of which I was one was very distinctly paternal, friendly paternal. He was very, very much interested in us, our welfare, how we were getting along, and he would have liked to do a whole lot for us in the way of salary adjustments, and advancement but in those days we didn't even have a classification law - we had a statutory roll - and the Director could move us up about so high and then he couldn't move us any higher because the law didn't give him the money. But I never had any feeling in that office, or in any of the other offices in which I worked that there was a sharp line between management and the administrative offices.

If we should resort to the kind of pressure tactics that are borrowed from the industrial world it seems to me we fail to recognize that the difference is in the set-up in a private corporation. Management has authority to act, and you can make a binding agreement with management. In the government service very rarely does a secretary, head of a department, have authority to act. Very frequently he's absolutely bound by law. It doesn't follow always that the sympathy of the Secretary is with the employee-positions, whereas the sympathy of Congress is against the employee. We had a striking illustration of that during the first World War. The Postmaster General at that time felt that it was outrageous for the old-line government employees to ask for an increase in salary when the country was at war, when the boys were in the trenches getting \$30 a month. The fact that the cost of living had skyrocketed and that the employees in old establishments like the Post Office, to a certain extent Agriculture, to a certain extent Interior, were having a terrific time, it didn't mean anything to him at all. As I recall, the Secretary of Agriculture at that time took more or less the same position, but the appeal was carried to Congress, carried to Congress in part by the organized government employees, and Congress was aware of what had taken place. And if you know that history back there we had what is known as the Five and Ten Act - 5% increase to certain people, 10% for certain

other people - that was followed by the 120 Bonus Act and then by the 240 Bonus Act and then by the Classification Act.

But the government employees are not restricted as to the line of action which they should take. The government employees can take the matter up with their Chief, and through their organizations they can take the matter up with Congress. There may be individual administrative officers that cause some trouble, but I have known of many cases in which the union representative has gone over the head of the person who was causing the trouble and found that his superior officers weren't advised of the fact and the policy which that individual officer was pursuing was not the policy that was desired by the Department.

I want to say a few words about attitudes towards the "big boys" at the top. I was listening to - oh, half-way listening to - a football game broadcast, I guess it was Sunday afternoon, and all of a sudden the announcement was made that the quarterback was in a tight spot, and that quarterback was in a tight spot. The whole success of his team was going to depend, perhaps, on the signal that he called, the play that he said, the decision that he made instantly down there on the field. He had about so many seconds in which he could make up his mind, and he had two major possible lines of action; one was to kick on the fourth down and lose the ball and the other was to call any one of a great host of plays that he might have. As a matter of fact he took the conservative decision - that helped lose the game. Well, a lot of our administrative officers are in somewhat the same situation. They've got to call the signals. Now, there isn't any one way of doing it. There are several different ways of doing it, perhaps several major different ways of doing it, within those major ways many different possibilities. But somebody's got to call it. We can't have all the members of the team barking those signals, each one making a different type of decision. And we have to entrust the calling of the signals to one member of the team. And when he calls them of course it's up to every member of the team to try to make success of the play that he called for. Now, maybe every member of the team, almost every member of the team, might feel that there was a better way, a better signal that that quarterback could have called. And there might be ten better ways that could have been called. Each member of the team may have an idea, "Well, it could have been better done this way." But somebody has to make the decision. And the administrative officer has to make it.

I had a rather interesting experience in 1915 when I resigned as assistant chief of the Children's bureau and went over to the New York Bureau of Municipal Research. I was given, at the New York Bureau of Municipal Research, an individual research assignment. I was to write a book on the principles governing the retirement of public employees, and I didn't have one particle of administrative responsibility. I didn't even have a stenographer. If I wanted some typing done or stenographic work done I could ask for a stenographer and she would be assigned to me for the length of time that I needed her. I didn't have a single other thing to worry me. And I felt that I was getting grand pay for the best vacation that I had had in a good many years. It reminded me of the delightful last

two years of college when I was far enough along that I was only taking those subjects in which I was interested, and I was working on them because I was interested. I was tremendously interested in the subject which was assigned to me. I think I was asked to come there primarily to work on that particular project, but I didn't have any responsibilities.

Now, you sometimes can look at the office of the big boss and you think, "Well, gee, that is certainly a swell job." You can see the authority he's got, the power he's got and the things that go with it. Maybe today a special parking lot out back where he pulls right in where he wants to, but this business of being a captain of the team is not all privilege. I suppose one of the things that bothers you most on a job like that is the way human beings react. Two or three things have happened during my experience. After all, people that you had thought were pretty big turn out to have a very narrow streak. I will give you one illustration: During the World War, I was back in the service in a non-Civil Service office, trying to do a job and struggling with red tape. One woman employee had done a perfectly ~~gorgeous~~ job for me. I wasn't able to get her salary increased. I had another position which had to be filled and the best person to fill it was another woman of very similar experience and training. And knowing that I couldn't get the salary increased after I put her on, I put her on at a higher salary than this other woman had been getting, and oh, I had a terrible rumpus over that. That very able, fine employee was perfectly outraged that I had done such a thing. I tried to explain to her exactly why I had done it, that it increased my chances of getting her salary raised (as a matter of fact it enabled me a few weeks later to get that salary raised) but I had committed a terrible injustice against that employee who had served me faithfully. I'd given more reward to the one who had just served a few hours than I'd given the one who had labored during the heat of the day. I was terribly upset about it. I was doing the very best I knew how.

There are jealousies; there is pulling and hauling; there is internal bureau politics of one kind and another, and all that comes up to the fellow at the top, or part of it may come up to the fellow at the top. That's another difficulty the fellow at the top has - he isn't sure that he has always got the whole of it, there may be another side to it, and he's entitled to a good deal of sympathy and in every organization you know there's bound to be criticism. It's a good wholesome thing, but if you find yourself getting into a terrible fever about things try sometimes to put yourself in the position of the supervisor and try and figure the thing out from the way it's hitting him. There are lots of sides to it.

I am thinking at the moment of one organization where the actual work the organization does is very distinct from the financing of that work. And every now and then people who are concerned only with the work itself will forget all about the fact that the Director has to figure on getting his money. That used to be true down in the Census Bureau. There was a lot of criticism there of certain administrative officers because they didn't do thus, and they didn't do so, but the problem came in their relationship with Congress.

Now that ties in, in a way, with the simple thought that I want to leave with you: that in these days we've got to play "team ball" of the football type, and under that kind of a game each one has to play his part - play it well regardless of the size of the part, regardless of the nature of the duties. Now we crave individual action. We'd like, perhaps, all to be soloists (I don't know about that) but, we have 24-hour days, and in our generation, and it seems to me it's going to be more true in the future, if you want to get something, where you can have absolute self-expression, absolute freedom, doing just what you want to do because you want to do it, you've got to get that outside of office hours.

COMMENTS

Lectures: Since the School was held, it has been brought to the attention of the committee that in 1930 an association of business executives held a series of lectures and discussions with the same general theme, or objective. Their real objective was, basically, the first part of our purpose as stated above, getting greater service, although it was recognized that the second part was necessary and contributed to the first. Their approach was thru leadership while the School's approach was thru the individual initiative of employees. An interesting coincidence is that they used one of the same speakers and that the subject of their last lecture, a life philosophy, was the same.

Dr. Taeusch said that philosophers "see things whole." For that reason the first day was given over to a consideration of the total situation. If an employee is to develop a philosophy (and Taeusch, 4th paragraph, says he needs one "to live through it"), a satisfactory working philosophy, he must consider, not just his own work-place or section, but the larger and broader things of which his own work-place is merely a part.

Since the purpose of the School was not directly stated, the committee believing that it was best to let that idea develop (and it did develop) the speakers the first day were inclined to be paternalistic, and to rationalize things as they are. They seemed to feel that the employees had some complaint or were after more privileges. They couldn't seem to understand employees seeking ways to give, - not to get. Hence, they tried to explain that things just had to be as they are; that the "boss" had to "call the signal" and that the employee should consider himself in a "minority" position, accept the signal as called, and hope that tomorrow or next year he would be the "majority" and could tell the other fellow what to do.

That "philosophy", however, did not prevail for a minute in the discussions. There it was accepted that of course the employees were interested in improving the work of their organization and in contributing more to its objective. This was not mentioned directly, but all of the hundreds of questions proposed for discussion tended in that direction.

Whether we have interpreted right the attitude of the speakers or not, they did give a fine and comprehensive statement of the overall situation. Dr. Ross placed before us a brief but comprehensive picture of a world condition so astounding and so far-reaching that its implications require time to grasp.

Briefly he said that this gigantic struggle now going on between the "haves" and the "have-nots" could not be settled, except temporarily, by war or treaty or compromise, or by any other known means. No matter what is done at the close of this war, population pressures will again develop. and when these pressures become great enough, the people will again resort to war. Why? Because populations are still rapidly increasing. We hear much about birth control which in reality affects very few, but little about "death-control" which prolongs the life of the many. On top of this, the

world's primary resources on which populations depend, soil and forest, are still being destroyed.

In addition, since individuals cannot be expected to take the long-time point of view and make the short-time sacrifices required in their preservation the government will continue to expand its activities.

This is a picture which may well make every government employee think, but since it is so big and so far-reaching it was not given much consideration in the discussions.

Before commenting on the discussion conferences it may be of interest to include here some extracts from the many voluntary comments that have been received from administrative officers. Practically all commentors thought that systematic follow-up of the School should be made, and a few made suggestions as to how this might be done.

There were a few adverse comments but these were not put in writing. In general, they (the adverse) centered about the enormous loss of time and the unjustified cost to the tax-payer in having 500 employees away from their work for hours listening to a professor who knows nothing of their work and therefore can be of no help to them in doing it. But most comments were different. Here are a few:

"I was impressed by the earnestness with which members of the discussion groups took part in the group discussions and attempted to analyze the abstract philosophical observations of the speakers in terms of their own attitudes and efficiency on the job."

"They (the discussions) were important as a demonstration of the principle that open-minded discussion of this kind is healthy and should be employed more fully."

"It seemed to me important that the lectures and discussions raised so many questions."

One girl in another Bureau wrote, "Ideas which have come to me from the School which will be of value to me in my life", and listed five of them.

An acting Regional Forester wrote, "It is thought that if the recordings were made available to the Region, we could conduct a similar school of philosophy, selecting capable discussion leaders from among our Regional personnel and thru local discussion meetings fit the expressed philosophy to our local situation."

"In my opinion the philosophy conference was a good 'shot in the arm' for everyone who attended all the meetings. However, it will be little more than that unless some follow-up is taken in the Forest Service."

"It seems to me that the staff should demonstrate more effectively, its concern over employee morale and efficiency."

"The idea here is to plan for systematically extending the School of Philosophy idea on down to our own Service, Division, and inter-division problems."

"Mr. Clapp had a fortunate spot in the program and I noticed that the audience gave him very close attention and showed marked interest in his talk." "This is the first time that a large section (4/5 of the W.O. and 300 others) of our own people have had an opportunity to hear Mr. Clapp discuss the program."

CONFERENCES

There were ten separate conferences, averaging about twenty employees each. Each conference, during the first phase, was entirely independent of all other conferences, chose its own subjects and expressed its own thoughts. One thing remarked by everyone was the speed with which they got into action and the universality of interest and participation. One leader reported "all of my group took part;" another, all but one; and at the extreme other end, "all but three." Enthusiasm increased from day to day, but it began this first afternoon, for this was essentially not a philosophy school but an emotional school. People "felt" more than they expressed.

Many and diverse were the subjects proposed, some suggested by the lectures and some already in employee minds, but all related to the central theme of the school. Many wondered why Dr. Taeusch thought there was "dynamite" in a simple question about democracy, especially before any opinions had been expressed and further, why so many (four) of the speakers expressed their belief that it (democracy) had no place in the organization or control of a Department. The autocratic method just had to be; just one of those things you had to compensate for on the outside (Smith); the quarterback had to call the play (Meriam); there is no concept of political democracy in our jobs, but rather it is a way of life and our relationship with individuals (Ross).

On the other hand the employee groups thought otherwise. No one of course suggested "majority rule" in determining Bureau policy. That is the political method. And had Dr. Meriam considered that, before the game, the entire team had participated in planning strategy and devising plays, he would have either changed his position or changed his figure of speech. Then, too it was brought out that in reality it is neither the boss nor the majority that should rule but the facts of the situation. If both know all the facts they usually agree as to the right thing to do. The employee, like the members of the team, like to help in getting all the facts out into the open. And isn't there more democracy in that than in just voting once a year?

Besides that a pretty good brand of democracy is being practiced now, here and there in the Department, by democratic-minded individuals. And it was agreed that "the truly democratic supervisor, or superior officer, in the Department sticks out like a sore thumb."

Sometimes the same question came up in several groups. For example, "Should a stenographer question the material dictated by her superior?; if there are errors should she correct them?" - worded variously was discussed by at least three groups.

Another question that caused some exceptionally interesting discussion was: "How shall we teach manners?" This ties back to Dr. Meriam's lecture, and was proposed by a clerk, not an executive. The opinion of the group was that, in general, it is better to try to enlist the best intentions of the employee toward the farmer and the public, and a desire to serve and to do a good job. The right attitude usually carries with it acceptable manners, and further unpolished manners are overlooked if a good intent is evident.

Not all questions were carried to a conclusion but all started people thinking.

Among other questions discussed were: "Will Federal ownership of land aid the problem of diminishing soil resources?"

"How can workers be made more interested in their work and therefore harder workers?"

"How is the worker in a more or less static position, to keep hope alive?"

"What do you do with the girl who teaches what she knows about the work to the other girls?" (Dr. Meriam said, "Promote her.")

"How can self-expression be fostered on a purely routine job such as card punching?"

"What can the employee herself do to make her work more interesting and more effective?" Quite an extensive program was developed by the discussion group under this topic.

October 2.

Subject: The Place of Democracy in Society and Within the Government Organization.

Democracy, its Broad Meaning and its Function
in the Social Structure -- Father Walsh.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the School:- May I at the outset express to you my real gratification at being permitted to participate in this very constructive, and I know, very helpful activity - an indication of the close contact of the personnel of government functions and the obligations of government. Naturally, at this time your attention and my attention, in fact the attention of the entire world, is centered on trying to penetrate the very obscure and the very unpredictable future. The significance and the inner meaning of the events that are now transpiring in Europe, in Asia and in Africa - the inner meaning, I say - is very liable at times to be submerged and lost in the sense of the sensational; the important is being obscured by the incredible as the Nazi war machine marches onward and onward from one conquest to another. Every successive ultimatum of the German Government during the last two years, every progressive advance of that war machine, each new conquest of territory and each disappearance of some other sovereignty was regarded at the moment as being the ultimate -- ne plus ultra of blitzkrieg. That pattern was first revealed with the occupation of Austria, the effective Anschluss in 1935, when the nations of the world made their second fatal error and permitted the unfolding of the further blueprints to an extent that has now become a menace to all civilization.

Why do I say the second mistake? The first mistake, tragic, pregnant of results later, was the failure to recognize and oppose the progressive invasion of Japan in Manchukuo. That was a test case. Nothing happened beyond sterile protests; the strongest of them all being registered by the United States, however. In the case of Austria, the Nazi government there ascertained what it wanted to know - whether or not the great powers were really prepared to challenge the program. If they had challenged effectively that moment, I do not believe you and I would be witnessing the challenge, the tragedy that is ours today. "Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these; it might have been." This convulsion that has now come upon the world might at least have been deferred for a long, long time if the great powers on that occasion had said, "No!" Hitler was not prepared to say "Yes" and to give the devil his due, there was only one power on that occasion that tried to stop him, and that was the now tragic figure of Mussolini.

You remember when Hitler tried his first ansschluss against Austria, who was it that mobilized a million men in the Brenner Pass and said "No!" He backed off. The second time, however, in this year of '35 when Mussolini found himself alone, he said, "Why should I,

all along? England, France and the others are doing nothing" and the juggernaut rolled. That was the second great error. Now, when I say that Hitler found out something, he found out that no effective resistance need be feared, and therefore the blueprints of that long-prepared and grandiose vision of total conquest was successively and successfully revealed - swiftly. Munich, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Istanbul, France, Bulgaria, Rumania, Jugoslavia, Greece. Fifteen sovereign states in the first two chapters - conquered and absorbed by the modern Genghis Khan.

Only one European power separated from that maelstrom by a narrow channel about 23 miles wide, still resists and holds its head unbowed, though bloody, mid the smoking ruins of European civilization. Finally at 6:20 A.M. on Sunday, June the 22nd, 1941, Herr Hitler rang up the curtain on the next act, doing it with that sense of drama with which he is well acquainted, and he promised that that next act would be the greatest campaign the world has ever seen - the invasion of Soviet Russia. He was correct in that description; incorrect in the other prognostication that it would soon be achieved. With that further unfolding of the pattern which had been temporarily modified for purely military reasons by the German-Soviet pact of 1939, the world revolution entered boldly and vociferously on a very definite and possibly a decisive phase of the titanic conflict now reddening the horizons of the Old World. When I say that the world revolution entered upon a decisive phase, I mean that the conquest of Soviet Russia by national Socialism, or vice versa, was always inherent to the dynamic consummation of the social revolution begun in 1917 in Soviet Russia and continued now by the leaders of the Nazi government. Two such protagonists - Russia and Germany - two such claimants to the universal control that they both maintained - at least laid claim to - two such protagonists, I say, simply could not coexist on the continent of Europe. That 1939 alliance of Naziism with Marx Communism was simply an interlude, an interlude of prudence, contrived by Hitler as temporary insurance against attack from the East while he unloosed his blitzkrieg on the West. He simply then bought off Stalin by offering him a free hand in Eastern Poland, Bessarabia and the Baltic states. Invasion of England having failed, and with the sand running low in the hour-glass of destiny, the Nazi government simply reverted, on that Sunday morning last June - June 22nd - simply reverted to its permanent and never-abandoned policy respecting the Bolshevik government which Hitler despises, both as made up of human beings which he considers as hyenas, and he also despises them as soldiers. I use the word hyenas because those are his words. If you will consult Mein Kampf, which is the true testament of his inner belief and outward conduct, you will find that he calls the rulers of the Soviet states hyenas - not to be trusted, the very scum and dregs of humanity. Now that is the true attitude and always was. The other was simply a temporary coalition of two racketeers; both of them out for control of certain areas, but forging a truce for purely conventional reasons.

In the last few days, with the scales of battle hanging about even on those tremendous steppes of Russia, a new and a tantalizing

problem is facing the Government of the United States. To what extent is Soviet Russia to be considered a beleaguered democracy; to whom lend-lease money, equipment, military supplies and encouragement ought to be extended? How shall the Soviet Ambassador be answered when he applies to the Treasury for lend-lease support for freedom in Russia? It is an embarrassing moment. I do not intend to add to the embarrassment of the administration and public officials at this time beyond saying that if, as the poet says, "Adversity makes strange bedfellows," certainly Mr. Hitler's statecraft has achieved the most startling shotgun marriage in the history of international relations. And with due sympathy for the position in which the State Department and the President find themselves I'll leave that thin ice I think merely with that comment engraved on it.

Now you and I, ladies and gentlemen, I think are living in a generation which future historians will doubtless characterize as one of the transitional periods in the history of the race. Indeed many thoughtful sociologists have felt the earth tremors long ago, felt the fault, the slip in the structure of society, and many sociologists and historians have prophesied - but prophesied in vain - that the world was in for one of those moments of historic agony and transition such as dot the pages of past history. It was a pleasure in coming into this audience this morning to meet a man who has written about this sort of thing for many years - Professor Ross of the University of Wisconsin. His writings I have been familiar with and though, as no writer can expect, would he expect me to agree with every word he has ever written, as I am sure he will not agree with every word that I have written, nevertheless we are both, I am sure, in agreement on this - that both of us lived in and saw the beginning of the transition that this generation is witnessing. I always maintained, and I know that he saw it early also, that the influence of the Russian Revolution and the new force, the ferment introduced into the social structure of the world in Russia in 1917 was destined then to be one of the most important events in the history of social relations.

I have even gone so far as to use the phrase that the "Fall of the Romanoff Dynasty" - the break-up of that empire and the coming of the Bolsheviks is analogous with the fall of the Roman Empire in the fourth or fifth century of the Christian Era with the subsequent break-up of Europe into a Feudal system, and in the emergence of the national state system out of that. Indeed the influence of the Russian Revolution in my opinion is precisely in the same field of pressure - pressure upon the existing social structure. Because what did Lenin do? Lenin immediately ceased being an academician and became a practical strategist; and so after all those years spent in the theoretical propagation of Marxism in Siberia, and in smoky restaurants in Paris - usually below the level of the streets - and in Zurich, in a little place that I visited there just to see what the background was, on the street where he and his wife lived in two small rooms where she cooked, as he said later, the daily mess of macaroni over an oil stove. After living for a whole generation in that atmosphere suddenly Russia dropped

into his hands like a rotten apple by the shake of a tree. Stunned almost by the suddenness of it he still had the genius of a revolutionist - a revolutionist whose influence is great and in my opinion in many respects very harmful - still with the genius of a revolutionist he began to change conditions into new strongholds for the part. And from Russia there then emanated the beginnings of that socio-political phenomenon which marked the intervening 20 years. By that I mean this, that I consider the outstanding fact of the post war period to have been the deliberate cultivation of hate as a motive of state power; not the cultivation of protest, or of reform, but the cultivation of hatred as the springboard.

You will remember that immediately calling together the mal-content, the discontent in every country, Lenin founded the Third International, an organization which was to spread the disruptive elements of his hatred against one class in the entire world, and through them little by little, by the later enlarged organization of the Third International there spread throughout every country this organized, subsidized, scientifically formulated ferment of hatred. It was organized with an hierarchy of gifted intensities of hate. First of all you remember he divided humanity very simply by a line which, I like to think, might be described as horizontal; that all the world was either bourgeois or proletarian - two classes. You fell into one or other of those classes. You were either of the employing class or of the employed class and that's the end of it. There was no other division for your Communist ideologue. All other personal qualities and virtues of birth, of intellectual capacity, of physical configuration of inventive genius, esthetic sensitivity - all of those for your orthodox Marxian ideologue are simply subsidiary, of minor importance, and must be viewed in the light of the class distinction. Is he or is he not a bourgeois or a proletarian. And if he is a bourgeois with all the other qualifications he is to be eliminated. Now that was the first principle and between those two groups, according to Lenin, there is perpetual animosity, perpetual resentment, perpetual antagonism, and until one or the other is eliminated there is bound to be warfare, there is bound to be social strain, there is bound to be resentment all through the world. It was natural then on that premise to proceed to the next. Class consciousness, then must be stirred up all through the world. After class consciousness comes class hatred; class hatred leads to class warfare. Class warfare in the Marxian book is only the prelude to world revolution. That, I think, is as condensed an expose of Marxian technical philosophy - not the metaphysical end of dialectical materialism - in the shortest condensation I think that I could give.

Now then this was an attack on the solidarity, and really on the charity of the human race from the left. That was met by a counter-attack from the right. Just as love begets love, so hatred will beget a lustily reciprocated hatred; and so that hatred is disturbed, poisoned. The bloodstream of the post-war generation was met by an equally vigorous hatred from the right; from the ranks of Fascism and Nazism. They struck from the right. Naziism, like Communism, has

an ideology; it has a very complicated philosophy; it even has a religious stratum; and the basic note there is the criterion of blood, racial superiority, reverting to the old and the discarded theory of Nordic superiority that was popularized by Bodoni and by Houston Stuart Chamberlain. Reverting to that, I say that the Nazi ideologue such as taught by Rosenberg and Hesse in his day, also drew a line through humanity, and separated humanity in the same way that Lenin did, but by a line that I like to visualize as being vertical, right up and down - not horizontal as the Bolshevik was. And that vertical line of demarkation is furnished by the question, have you or have you not Aryan blood in your veins? Now if you have Aryan blood you are one of the elect; you are of the Herinfolka; you are of the chosen race. But you may have that blood in your veins, even as a king, you are still accepted. Your aristocracy may be in the favored category - bourgeois, proletarian, all of them. So you see the Nazi division, though it is an oversimplification of humanity, nevertheless much more inclusion, a much wider inclusion than does the Bolshevik. But they both participate in this; they both visualize world domination.

Time will not permit me in the second part of this address to point out to you what in my opinion the effect of all this has upon democracy. Time does not permit me to trace that anti-social philosophy of the Herinfolka to its origin; but if you did you would find that it is not new with Hitler. It goes back as far as Fichte; it developed from his teachings in the University of Berlin in 1808 and his published philosophy.

Those 14 extraordinary speeches of his to the German people at about that time contain the whole seed of this same arrogant, dominating spirit. You will find that he was succeeded by Hegel in the same chair, and Hegel himself then added a very subtle, a metaphysical justification to the supremacy of the German state. He was followed by Nietzsche who added his superman, the transmutation of all values, and the complete subjugation of society to his idea of the Nordic blond beast. That's all in Nietzsche. So that it's a direct line of descent. Mr. Hitler simply took all that together, encased it in shining armor in the form of his blitzkrieg and simply exploded it in the mind of an astonished generation.

Now just as the Bolshevik's oversimplification is unhistorical, untrue, so too is the Nazi oversimplification, namely, that Aryan hypothesis. Time would not permit to touch even the absurdities of that supposition, but briefly I must say that there is no such thing as an Aryan racial criterion; there is no such thing, as far as I know, as an Aryan race. The word Aryan is a philological term. Maxmuller and the others who really founded modern philology would turn over in their graves - although he contributed not a little at the beginning of the Aryan hysteria - but they would turn over in their graves to see the misuse of a philological term applied to an ethnic purpose.

All we know about the Aryan, ladies and gentlemen, can very well be condensed on two pages of typewriting, although there are huge and ponderous volumes about it. All we know definitely is, that at an undated epoch - historians don't even dare to date it - that there was a certain group of Indo-Germanic origin inhabiting that plateau that stretches down to the Hindo-Cush mountains and over into India; that there was a race of men, probably tall and blond, and that they came into contact with and defeated another race that were dark with lank hair, and with the general characteristics of what we call a Mediterranean. That is about all we know. Now, from the fact that the modern German, the Modern English, in fact all of the inter-Germanic languages speak the same speech which they spoke, the Aryan crowd such as Gobineau and Houston Stuart Chamberlain, and Hitler; they assume that therefore because they speak within the same family of languages, they speak the same tongue; therefore their blood stream is probably the same. Now that's what we call, in poetry, a lyric leap - very much a lyric leap, with no historic or scientific justification at all. In fact it's about as bad as the delusion once pointed out by a man in Cherbourg, in France. I happened to come down from Paris once to catch a boat, and I had to stand in line a bit to get visas and passports ironed out, and there was standing in front of me a gentleman who was having a very interesting conversation with the consular clerk, and I could not help hearing, although I wasn't listening. You know you can frequently overhear without eavesdropping. The conversation was very interesting and exemplified the point I am making about the lyric leap. The young man asked the gentleman's name and he gave it; and nationality, and he said English. Where was he born; he replied, Edinburgh, and the young man put that down, but looked up very politely and said, "excuse me, but you said Edinburgh. "Yes, Edinburgh -- that is right, and I'm English. Because a cat has kittens in the oven does that make them biscuits?"

So, simply because you and I and all the members of the Indo-Germanic group in the fourth great language division of the human race happen to speak a language which has some form, some roots, some words, some general configuration similar to that which probably the Aryan spoke, to assume that we therefore are of the same blood, or that it makes a particle of difference, is about as rational as the cat having kittens in the oven.

I leave that for a moment and proceed to my final consideration. I might go on all morning this way, because the absurdities of the supposition are such that it would be a pleasure to demolish them, just as it has been a pleasure for twenty years to attack and at least to retard the very hateful class warfare theory of the Bolsheviks. They pour that poison into the veins of the rest of the world. They pour it deliberately with the result that the generation already shell-shocked from the first world war, was further irritated, was further confused by having these motives poured drop by drop, finally phial by phial into their veins - with the results that you and I know.

I consider it an outstanding and a most sinister element in the post war period, namely, that cultivation of hate.

Now how does all this affect the position of democracy in the United States at the present moment? The defense of that democracy to which this nation is now committed to an extent never before undertaken by any government in the history of international relations requires a twofold mobilization of our resources. Notice, ladies and gentlemen, how we are doing it. We are doing it enormously. We are doing it in the superlative degree, which is quite characteristic of the American reaction in all crises. We do everything the biggest, the best and the most ever. I believe that that is due to this. I do not think that we have successfully worked out a social philosophy in this country as a fixed, definite pattern for government, or for even wide social relationships. We are still in a very experimental stage and I believe that not having a properly developed positive philosophy of social objectives in this country we have no positive degree in our social languages. We only have comparative and superlative degrees. We don't like to speak in a comparative degree because that means we compare ourselves to somebody else. We stick to the superlative. Now I challenge you to examine your consciences and find if that's not so. Have we not the highest buildings in the world? We point to them as symbols, the highest buildings, with of course, the most unlet office space in the world. Do we not dig deepest into the bowels of the earth, with probably also the greatest disasters in mine history. Do we not go down deep into the sea? Does not Mr. Beebe go down 500 fathoms and there photograph the most intimate domestic relations of fishes? Haven't we the most telephones in the world, and I think the most irresponsible chatter in the world. I think you know what I mean if you have ever lived on one of those rural lines. We have the most radios in the world, certainly. And what's the result - that the welkin is split from the North Pole to the South Pole with a cacophony of sound every night unparalleled in the history of disharmonious music.

Now, as Mr. G. K. Chesterton, whom I knew very well in England and loved very much personally, as everyone did who knew him - he was such an exhalation of sincerity, both in size and in spirit. As he said just before he died, "the tragedy about the radio is that it had to come at the precise moment in the history of the world, with its facility for universal talk, when nobody had anything to say." By which he meant that nobody had anything constructive that could save the world from the tragedy upon which we arrive.

And now we are doing the externals of defense in that characteristic superlative way, and don't forget the cost, ladies and gentlemen. The cost will be the biggest and best in the history of fiscal relationships. We established a civilization here during the hundred years of the industrial era that followed the Congress of Vienna when peace was restored to the world and that development of mechanical ingenuity of man was given free rein. We on this continent

developed and evolved into what is described as the greatest mechanical civilization in the world. Of course when 1929 came it crashed with the greatest and most resounding crash ever heard in the field of acoustics. Not only that, but that done, and the crash achieved, and all those suicides enumerated in New York of people who lost their fortunes, we then turned around, we did the next thing the biggest and best ever - we repented. We enunciated our act of contrition in the biggest, most, and the best series of quick social reforms ever put on the statute books of any nation in a similar time. We attempted in a few years, I think as most sociologists will admit, to do what other countries had taken generations to evolve. We wanted to do it immediately as a sign of immediate repentance the biggest, the best and the quickest. And then we went to the next, which is the biggest and the best in the cost of the act of contrition. Our internal debt is rapidly approaching 60 billion as you know, and the armament cost will be another 60 billion, independent of the first. So there will be I think within the next year or so a debt of over 100 billion dollars, which I say without peradventure of doubt or fear of challenge, is the greatest and the best in the history of the world.

Now, one reason for that is, I think, that democracy unlooses such a number of initiatives that it is liable to go to those excesses. And it is our obligation in this crisis to be sure that the restraints of intellectual and moral discipline hold fast on the headlong rush not only in the external field but in our ways of thought. You know, no one knew that better than the founding fathers. You remember that interesting episode when they came out from the Constitution Convention in 1787. It is related that a lady of Philadelphia (I have always wanted to find out who she was) said to Mr. Franklin, "Well, sir, what kind of government have you given us?" I can imagine she transfixed him with a lorgnette and simply demanded an answer. And he answered very wisely, "A republic, madam, if you can keep it." Now in that phrase I think you have the very essence of political wisdom, that the republican form of government while it may be the organization of civil society that is nearest the heart's desire, is still a very frail treasure, carried in the fragile and extremely delicate vessel of popular acceptance and clear understanding. Well, he knew from his 81 years of life that what we loosely call democracy is the easiest form of government to establish, but is the hardest to preserve and the hardest to maintain, and can come to corruption very quickly. Monarchies decay from the head downward. Democracies decay from the roots upward, and I think that a survey of the outstanding democracies of history reveals that relatively few have perished by external assault but many by internal corruption. The reason for that is evident, isn't it, on analysis? In proportion as population increases it will increase not only in number, but it will increase in variety of intelligence. Intelligence does not necessarily increase with education or other facilities, and the result will be that pressure groups and forms of irresponsible influence will seek more and more and more to control its benefits and take possession of its certain administration. The stability, the virtues therefore of that

collective personality will be the resultant of the attributes, the ideals and activities of those constituent units. Now mind, they are going up and up and up as population increases, and there is no Divine guarantee that the moment a citizen approaches a ballot box under democratic institution he is immediately endowed or even that a majority will become mysteriously endowed with any new light, any mystic nobility that will automatically elevate him above the vulgar prejudice, the hot passions and the private interests that preside in the masses.

That sudden bestowal of political power which representative democracy confers is not accompanied by a quick increase of reasoning power, detached objectivity, or a religious sense of sacrifice for the commonwealth. In fact the opposite frequently ensues under that first draft of liberty and equality which is a very heady wine and liable to cause delusions in the recipient thereof. Therefore we should be very cautious in not exaggerating the meaning of equality and freedom. Freedom is an attribute of democracy of course, but not undisciplined - an irresponsible freedom by participation of the people directly or indirectly in the making of the laws by which they are governed. That is the formal note; that is the clement distinguishing a workable democracy from an autocracy and an oligarchy. And I maintain - sometimes roundly assailed upon it - I maintain it again; freedom is not the distinguishing note of democracy. The distinguishing note is participation in government and they are quite opposite things. The drafters of the new Constitution never dreamed of founding a pure democracy, but only a controlled and well balanced democracy. Finally, be very careful, I beg of you, in speaking to students and to others, particularly those who have not had the discipline of philosophic analysis, about that wonderfully stimulating but dangerous gift of absolute equality. It's a delusion. It's a danger, and it is one of the things that will destroy democracy. Equality must be more carefully defined before it is more widely canonized. Nature itself is mistress there. Nature, aided and supplemented by human exertion and human ingenuity. No democracy, no congress, no system, whether it admirably provides social security provision, or any other system, can guarantee equality of brains, of physical attractiveness, of equality of imagination, equality of judgment, nor equality of initiative, nor equal capacity for success in each.

These differences spring from your individuality and they will be capitalized in varying degrees by your initiative, responding to legitimate opportunity. The freedom which democracy should guarantee is the general liberty indispensable to the equitable development of all those natural or acquired capacities implying, of course, a corresponding prohibition against encroachment on the co-relative freedom of others. And it shall guarantee, of course, equal justice under law impartially administered, without discrimination, arising from social position, religion, color, sex, wealth or poverty. Beyond that, democracy cannot safely go, and it must not promise more unless its ideals be complete standardization of humankind and the abolition

of some of the most characteristic and most valuable attributes of our human personality.

In a word, democracy cannot guarantee any equality except legal equality and common opportunities; nor can it guarantee equal opportunities, and I put great emphasis on the difference. I say, common opportunities. It is a delusion to say that democracy must guarantee equal opportunity for every citizen. It is impossible. Some by nature, some by birth, some by genius, some by strength, get and create new opportunities and neither government nor any form of social control can guarantee equality there, at least if you want to preserve peace. It can guarantee ordered liberty, but the very guaranteeing of that liberty inevitably encourages those personal inequalities that I mentioned. It encourages intellectual inequalities; it encourages financial inequalities, social inequalities. How? By releasing the human energies of brain and bodily strength, initiative and imagination which, as I said, are gifts of nature, not of democracy. And if government, its social theory, or its education, attempts to equalize these natural inequalities then, ladies and gentlemen, it will equalize them at the cost of liberty. It must proportionately penalize liberty. Now you cannot have both. And there is the paradox of the unthinking libertarian. He shouts for liberty and equality, and he is shouting for two mutually destructive qualities and gifts if they are applied in the sense that he shouts them. An equilibrium of equality must result in the restraint of legitimate liberty; restraint of genius to the least common denominator of standardized performance. And democracy assuredly cannot guarantee a social, economic or physical security any more than it can guarantee the weather, abolish floods, earthquakes and restrain similar phenomena. They are the hazards of life on this earth and those who want assured security will have to do it by bargaining their liberty. And that is exactly what is happening in the totalitarian states. I have always felt a little uneasy from this point of view, even about the terms of our national legislation, social security. We cannot guarantee any man in this life social security. Guarantee it? The hazards of life are such that you may do all that is possible to provide something, but I have felt uneasy about the guaranteeing, because to the unthinking and those who trust completely, if later the hazards of time and financial conditions do not permit that guarantee to be put into effect the moment of disillusionment is worse than the first and it is a very dangerous moment.

Now then, your demagogue knows the value of those ancient phrases, liberty, equality and fraternity, and he pushes them to an unreasonable degree; and he entices the gullible to a spurious democracy that will end every time by assassinating liberty in the name of equality and security. If no superiority is acknowledged whence comes the right of any human authority to govern or to lead? The only logical eventuality would be anarchism that expresses itself in the libertarian formula, neither God nor master.

What I am arguing against today, as you see (I want to leave that final thought with you) is against the oversimplification of complex human passions in the exaggerated promises that can be used by scheming fanatics, and will lead every time to disillusionment through failure to produce Utopia, followed by desperation of the masses, and then the final madness of revolt. That means the ethics of the jungle and the inevitable advent of the reign of force through seizure of power by some alert dictator. So near is democracy to tyranny, just as so near is life to death; only a hair divides them, and it has been committed to us to keep that balance. Trees always fall on their leaning side. So, likewise, governments. In the words of Edwin Burr, liberty to be enjoyed must be limited by law for law ends where tyranny begins; and the tyrant is the same, be it the tyranny of a monarch or the tyranny of a multitude. Nay, the tyranny of a multitude may be the greater since it is multiplied tyranny. You remember Aristotle says that tyranny is merely mass, weight, power, passion without interlude. That, my dear friends, in my opinion, is the present mutual position of democracy in the world revolution; and that tendency to exaggeration is also in my opinion the leaning side of the American democracy. God grant that it be not too late to repair that damage. We have learned enough; we have seen blood and sweat and tears. God grant that this beloved land of ours, together with our sister republics of Latin America, may nobly meet their rendezvous with destiny - destiny which, as I visualize it, is to become and to remain the impregnable fortress - the last refuge of faith in human sanity, of hope for human progress and the charity of universal brotherhood.

The Place of Democracy in the Department Structure; What does this Offer to the Government Employee; to What Extent Should he Renounce Freedom of Thought and Speech and Action? - Dr. Smith.

Mr. Chairman, and my fellow Bureaucrats; not to say fellow students and fellow citizens: "He who knows not, and knows that he knows not, is a fool - shun him. He who knows not, and knows that he knows not, is a student - teach him. He who knows, and knows not that he knows, is asleep - wake him. For he who knows and knows that he knows, is wise - follow him." This proverb, presumably from the ancient East, arises out of the period of human sophistication, or lack of it, in which a great many men could claim to know, and to know that they know, and get by with it.

Unfortunately, the march of technical civilization with its intellectual specialization as a counterpart, has made it next to impossible for any man to claim that latter honor of knowing, and knowing that he knows, so that he can ask people in good faith to follow him. Not that we do not have knowledge for certain, but that certain knowledge in our time is bought so dearly and paid for with a price of ignorance so colossal and pathetic that most of us would do better to spend our time in penitence for the price of ignorance paid for our special knowledge than in gloating over the leadership which normally would ensue from its claim. And I think life would be a poor spectacle in a specialized age of pretentious knowledge were it not for the fact that we have one capacity, each and all, which comes to us to compensate us for our widened ignorance, and to fertilize our ever narrower knowledge.

As a man by my same name said not so long ago in a book I wish I might have written - Russell Gordon Smith - a little book called "Fugitive Papers" - "God saw everything that he had made and behold it was very bad. On the seventh day, therefore, God did not rest. In the morning and evening He busied himself with terrible and beautiful concoctions and in the twilight of the seventh day He finished that which is of more import than the beasts of the earth, the fish of the sea and the lights of the firmament. He called it imagination. For no other reason was imagination given unto us than that we might re-fashion the Creator's wretched handiwork." We have, I say, each and all, the capacity that compensates us for our ignorance by spreading over it that magic mantle of wonder which seduces curiosity and fortifies reserve and skill in exploring, ever and anon, the ever widening new. But also we have it so that if we can spread it over our specialized knowledge we shall fertilize that knowledge in the direction of our colossal ignorance.

I speak to you therefore, to the topic, but about imagination. I speak in a certain spirit of sadness following this, in general, magnificent address of Fathor Walsh, for it is one of the symptoms of the spiritual dilemma of our time that it has been left to those who are, as he put it, the apostles of hate to become the voice of the everlasting yea of men; and left, as he so intimately and poignantly demonstrated to those who are the voices of the benevolence of mankind to speak for the everlasting nay of man. And as between those who in the name of benevolence deny hope to the masses

and those who hate but offer the dream of utopia, we observe the everlasting paradox of mankind. And the point of view with which we approach whatever we do approach, whether in the spirit of the everlasting yea, of liberty and equality, or in the spirit of the everlasting nay, be cautious about your liberty. Be afraid of your liberty. Look upon equality as a great danger instead of a great hope. As children of imagination, each of whom dramatizes himself necessarily as the center of the Universe, we must find some way of making the voices of benevolence yield forth the counsel of hope instead of those of everlasting passion.

It is in that spirit, but with I hope a sense of strategy, that I say now what further I say. The old proverb again has it that the view depends upon the point of view - but upon what does the point of view depend? I can say this, that the amount of imagination (since, as Dr. Taeusch put it yesterday, in opening the conference), of the perspective of seeing each in terms of all, and all as being the all of the eache of life, the amount of imagination, the sense of the periphery as over against the focus of life with which we mix whatever else we add, is the final determining factor as to how much democracy can prevail in the nation, and the world, and as to how much democracy can be made to prevail, whether of thought or of speech or of action, as the sub-title puts it, in any department of our organized technical life.

Let me illustrate what I mean. Take man. A big subject, and a very interesting one to us men. What is man? Well, from one point of view, a legitimate point of view, he is an animal that has a cavern in one side of his face, and an automatic feeding machinery to shovel food in it at appropriate, or inappropriate, hours. That is a creature, ladies, whom you reach through the stomach, and whom, if you hold, you hold through the glands. Such is man, from one point of view. Not an untrue point of view, but as we men think, a grossly inadequate one. Lift yourselves just a little upon the scale that I invite you to ascend with me through several illustrations - the scale of imagination. I give you the picture of man that was given me by a teacher in southern Illinois some years ago when I was Chairman of the Senate Committee on Investigating Schools. She said this came from a nine year old boy - though I have always suspected she wrote it herself. A composition - subject, Man. It went like this: "Man is made up of three parts, the head, the chist and the stomach. The head has in it the eyes, ears, nose, mouth and brain, if any. The chist contains the heart, the lungs, the gall, part of the liver; the stomach is devoted entirely to the vowels, of which there are five, namely, a, e, i, o, u, and sometimes w and y." I present you man from another point of view which differs from the first point of view really only in having a little more perspective and of having mixed with man of history what he has been, the man of science, what he is, and of imagination, what he may be. But if you want to see man at still the apex of possibilities, with a point of view which determines the view, remember to ascend the heights of poetry where the potential becomes the actual instead of the dead being the meaning of the actual. And in which what man has been and now is, history and science are rolled together - poetry and art, "Behold him - what a piece of work is man!" I won't quote the remainder of the Bard,

but say them to yourself if you know them. There you have man. Veritably the view there depends upon the point of view. No amount of argument and no amount of reasoning and no amount of finesse in the details can compensate for the difference that's made in the way you come at him when you begin to look at him, the view will at last depend upon the point of view.

Since I've taken man, out of deference to the predominance of women, let me take woman, for a second illustration. What is woman? Again the view depends upon the point of view. From the point of view, she's "a rag, a bone, and a hank of hair." Not an untrue point of view, but perhaps greatly inadequate. It's the point of view of the frustrating morning after the over-hopeful night before, in which:

"The time I have lost in watching and pursuing
The light that lies in woman's eyes
Has been my heart's undoing.
Though wisdom oft hath sought me,
I scorned the lore she brought me,
My only books were women's looks,
And follies all they taught me."

But lift yourself a little from that too prosaic point of view, too frustrated point of view, and too unmagnanimous and unperspective point of view - behold what the ancient legend again had it. It said, "When God came to make woman he found that he had used up all the solid material he had in creating man and the other critters - He was very perturbed about something solid of which to make her. Unlike that unimaginative and near barbarous thing which the Hebrew Christian, Jehovah, did - took a rib from man - I never liked it - he took, the Hindu god, the roundness of the moon, the undulations of the serpent, the inclining of the climbing plant, the slenderness of the rose stem, the glance of the mist, the inconstancy of the wind, the timidity of the hare, vanity of the peacock, softness of the down on the throat of the swallow, warmth of the fire, chill of the snow, the chatter of the jay, and the cooing of the turtle dove." All those he united to form woman, and I present her to you. The view depends upon the point of view. And what distinguishes the point of view more than all things else together, I repeat, is the amount of this potential, as over against the past and dead, the living and the actual, of taking the capacities, the potencies, the what-may-yet-be to add to what has been and is, and describing that potentiality as the actuality of man - of woman, or of the relation between them.

For, from one point of view love, someone has said, is just that seasonal heat that occasionally overtakes these animated lovers at play. That's not an untrue point of view, or an untrue view, but grossly inadequate. A little higher on the scale of seeing the thing in the vistas of an encompassing world of infinite wonder, I picked up on the Pacific coast not long ago, this story of a young swain who had been going with a girl longer than even his own conscience approved without serious gestures. Sitting out on the sand one day as the sun went down and she sitting close to him and he phlegmatic, as usual, she said to him, "John, what do the wild waves say to you?" As they looked toward the setting sun John dug his foot in the sand, and didn't

reply. She waited until the sun went down and the gloaming came on. She moved closer and said, "John, what do the wild, wild waves say to you?" And John dug his foot further into the sand, and as the gloaming passed, the stars began to come out, and in the mood of the poet,

"The night has a thousand eyes, the day but one,
Yet the light of the whole world dies
with the setting sun.
The mind has a thousand eyes, and the heart but one
Yet the light of the whole life dies
when love is done."

She moved closer to him and said, "John, what do the wild, wild, wild waves say to you? And John digging his foot further in the sand and looking up at last with only the faintest glimmer of the encompassing world of changing wonder in his eyes, he said, "Well, they don't say nothin' to me except slosh, slosh, on the sand."

The guy ought to be killed who doesn't have any imagination, and world of wonder. And so a Bureau chief, and so a stenographer, and so anybody else. The world of inter-related and complex human relationship that themselves constitute the glory or the despair of human life not to see those relationships in partial light at least, of that which never shown on land or sea. For that relationship between men and women when you push it a little higher up becomes what the contemporary poet has put it,

"If you and I are anything at all save mortal blood and flesh,
Precariously entangled in a thin, unstable mesh;
If back of Adam's molecules, electrons, we should find
One indivisible particle of matter or of mind,
One vital element of me, a dying spark of you
How then could death divide us more than life has tried to do?

Life brought us to our separate births, a world or two apart,
Yet your head never rested till it rested on my heart,
And when dissolving flesh hath set our inmost essence free
In strange and unfamiliar guise you still might come to me.
I wish I knew, if somehow we might always meet to touch,
Death could not frighten me at all, nor life distress me much."

Yes, love depends upon the point of view, as men depend upon the point of view, and women depend upon the point of view, and all things else depend upon the point of view. Philosophy is the discipline of the points of view in human life and the differential between them.

Now I am recommending to you here in a field this morning, of which I admit myself to be densely ignorant, the philosophic point of view, as being more the solution of all your problems than all of the other solutions put together could ever begin to be. I say ignorant - I should have discussed eloquently, and very much more soundly than Father Walsh, that larger topic, but that wasn't my topic. I know something about that. I don't know any-

thing about being chief of a division or head of a department, or working under somebody else. I ain't ever done either in my whole life. I have always refused, on principle, to be head of any department of anything in the world. But I know the price that you pay for that kind of temperament and it's not the price of which an integrated civilization is made.

An integrated civilization is made of the price that you pay for being in the relationship that you are, here, now; that you give me the honor of speaking upon. While I know nothing from experience about these inter-relationships, I know a good deal in the larger experience about how much difference it makes in the world day after day on which side of the bed you get up in the morning. And I know also that only those who sleep on the floor don't fall out of bed, when they go to bed. Consequently, I propose to say to you in the remaining moments somewhat more in detail, giving reasons for it, all of what Father Walsh said is true. If Father Walsh in the saying of it had meant what I mean by it, instead of what he meant by it. The view depends upon the point of view. It is one thing to tell the humblest, honest worker, my secretary, who knows only stenography, and not too much of that - it's one thing to tell her in the name of hierarchical organizations of life that your place is such and such. You be cautious to stay in it. For her place is such and such, and she does well to be cautious to stay in it. But it is one thing to tell her that from the point of view of an organized and ancient philosophy, and an organized and ancient institution of established hierarchies, and it is another thing to tell it to her from the promptings of her own experience of how things haven't worked out well, when she knew that she was free and that she was equal with the boss. She was free, and she is equal with the boss, and in a deep sense of natural humility and understanding she accepts her place.

I want to say too, that liberty is an illusion except as free men learn from experience, its limits. And equality is an illusion except as free men learn from experience, not dogma, its limits. And fraternity is an illusion all the time, because free men never learn from experience that their neighbors are as good as they are and that they can love other people as much as they love themselves. This is the view that I should like to present to you about this larger problem now as it compares with the small problem of my topic.

There are billions of things that any humblest member of any staffs may and does feel for in the life of feeling the sky even is not the limit. There we are all free, and so far as anything external can have to do with it we are all equal, but there we aren't fraternal. For each of us is the center, necessarily, of the world. And the egotist you know, is only the fellow who would have told you all the things about himself that you were telling him about yourself, if you had given him a break. Billions of things may be felt, millions of things may be thought, but the recession from the romantic meaning of life which democracy has always meant, fortunately, the recession from romance begins when you come from feeling to thought, for you can't think nearly as many things as you can feel. And while you can feel billions of things, and think millions of things, you can say thousands of things only. There is a further great recession from the life of ideals

covered by liberty, equality and fraternity in a secular, political sense; a further great recession. It is the tremendous price of waste of feeling that men pay in descending from feeling, through thought, to speech.

I was saying to one of the select group of freshmen, the ten percent best entering class of several years ago, when we were experimenting through what has been called the Chicago plan now that we have in operation. The University gave me the best entering ten percent of the freshmen for several years to experiment with in teaching them logic. I was saying one time at the beginning of the class when I didn't know anybody in it, that the great tragedy of human life is the fact that only a small fraction of what we know to be significant in our lives can we ever put into speech; can we ever communicate and get that unearned increment of added enjoyment of having somebody else send it back to us with the psychic wave that has swooned it into participation. And I grew bold and I said finally, "Why you can't put into language ten percent of the experience that you yourself hold to be significant in your life." There was a girl sitting on the front row shaking her head, very vigorously, against all this and I finally turned to her and I said, "You don't believe what I'm saying." She replied, "I don't believe a word of it." If I had known her then as I came to know her I'd have been more cautious. I said, "You can't put into words the simple experience of" - and I was trying to think of some illustration that would just bowl her over, you know - I said, "Do you like pumpkin pie?" She said, "I'm crazy about it." I said, "You can't put that into words - that simple thing." She said, "Will you give me till tomorrow?" I said, "Yes, take as long as you wish." Next morning she brought me back these lines:

"With a warmth like a father's love
Spiced as an Irish pun
Soft as the purling summer stream
Rich as the melting sun
Like liquid velvet glide and in my vitals lie
Oh gladly I could perish while eating pumpkin pie."

I thought that line, "Like liquid velvet glide", just pretty nearly gets into words the way it feels as it goes over the delightful top on the way down.

But even with the poet's art, and with the artist's sensitivity in the whole field of life, the price we pay in descending from thought that moves in terms of millions of things that can have it done to them, to speech that moves in terms only of thousands of things, that tragedy is the beginning of worldly wisdom as we pass from the ancient East to the wonders of boyhood, as Wordsworth put it, until finally, "the man perceives it die away, and fade into the light of common day." As Cable put it one time, in taking his novels down and looking at them he said, "I beheld in each one of them a human dream badly damaged at the birth." All things even put into speech or into artistic forms get so marred and mutilated that there is symbolized anew the great wastage of human life.

"If I might seize and capture in a song
One cadence that would ever charm the ear,
One burst of melody as sure and strong
As from the larks at summer dawn I hear;
If in a poem I might crystalize
One flying gleam of passion's swift surprise,
Or in the ageless permanence of stone
Prison some gesture's fugitive loveliness.
If I might paint that shining, golden tress
The wandering wind across her eyes has blown,
Oh if in some way I could make my own
One fleeting and uncapturable thing,
So men might come and see, or hear;
Saying the while of me, perhaps long dead,
'Oh beauty here was found
Here spoke thy slave, here toiled thy votary,'
I should lie quiet in my narrow bed
And ask no more of immortality.
Oh if in some way I could make my own
One fleeting and uncapturable thing!"

That seizing, that capturing of the uncapturable, that bringing even to verbal birth, the easiest of all births, of an iota of what men think, and the bringing to thought an iota of that which they have felt, each of these marks a triumph in creation, and each of them dramatizes the turmoil, the travail and the tragedy of human life, born for all the universe with his ideals, can think so little of what he feels, and can say so little what he thinks and finally can do so little of what he says. For billions of things may be felt, millions of things may be thought, thousands of things may be said, dozens of things only may be done.

It's in the field of action where finally you erect a monument to the tragedy of the spiritual life of man in the infinite and pathetic cost that has been paid for coming from feeling where life is centered to action where it must maintain itself, its that monument of the tragedy of the littleness of the possibilities of action which only imagination can reveal to you. For unless you have, as Bob Ingersoll once put it, like a man of imagination, felt in advance the joy of every heaven, and experienced in advance the pangs of every hell, you haven't entered into the heritage that belongs equally to the humblest and to the most ignorant and to the commonest of men. If once one sees what is the most difficult of all things to see, that action can never express more than an infinite iota of human capacity and that the price that is paid for any type of cooperative action is so tragically great because the opportunities of action are so limited, then and then only could we develop around the task of cooperative action the type of magnanimity and understanding that would smooth out through the point of view that you bring to your work the infinite contribution which human egotism makes to the human predicament of working one with another.

For the great task of human life that I am now prepared, I think, to say understandingly to you, is what we shall do with the surplusage of ideals

over all the possibilities of fulfillment in action. For if billions of things can be felt, and they make themselves romantic ideals; and if millions of things can be thought, and they make themselves ideals; and thousands of things can be said, and only dozens of things can be done, if action is always the choice between evils, and of course it is, then we don't have to be so damn persnickety about it. We are fortunate if we can agree upon anything as the common denominator that nobody will kick over the traces about, and proceed taking up that surplusage from the billions to the millions, to the thousands down to the dozens in some other way - in art, science, religion, in off-hour play, in day dreaming, which is mostly the business of life, even to the hardest boiled scientist. I once asked a number of the members of a College faculty what per cent of their working hours were actually employed in direct concentrated effort. The most optimistic reply was 25%. Where did the other 75% go? It went into day dreaming, of course, where it ought to have gone. For its only in day dreams, its only in the fantasy life of mankind that we can really be the great guys that we are, you know. It would be too bad if we died without having achieved full liberty and full equality - since there is the place to achieve it. For there is the lady in the dark in each one of us. Dark or light - and in each one of us moves that man whom the demagogue makes believe - because its true. Every man is a champ, and its only as we can do two things that we can come to men to reiterate with the undying faith of the dynamic that men are free - that men are equal and do it with the same assurance that the agents of malevolence are going it in the world. But can men establish and maintain a social order in which men and women will find out themselves how they'd better use that infinite freedom of egotism and that magnificent equality of self assertion. It is only then that we can reap the dynamic rewards that the malevolent are reaching by being themselves the voices in our times, of the everlasting yeas of human life.

How to take up that surplusage of ideas over all possibility of fulfillment in action. That's the fact, and there is nothing that will do that except first an imaginative encompassment of the total situation in which one is, plus the recognition that most of the things that billions feel can never be enacted. Oh I know I want myself to be off to the edge of the world, as the romantic poet has put it,

"Away from the realm of law
The land where never a flag's unfurled
And the life is rough and raw.
I want to be off where the roads are new
Or there's never a road to see
And ever and ever the long years through
The wilderness calls to me.

"Though I play my part in the business scheme
In bartering (and professoring, and politics) trade and sale
Deep in my secret soul I long for the joy of the open trail
I think of the pungent capped smoke swirl
And the breath of winds that blow, and I want to be off
To the edge of the world, but I haven't the nerve to go!"

Thank God you haven't the nerve to go. You don't have to go - you're already there. If you have explored and exploited the infinite reaches of feeling that are your very own, if you have developed the capacity to think ten thousand things more than you can say, and ten million more than you can ever do, you have in the reservoir of your own imagination, where alone true value lies, an instant retreat even in the cloud into the kingdom of the absolute ideal from which you can come back fortified for life.

Not that there aren't many ways of helping out at this - I mean not that there aren't many ways for the stenographer with the question that came up yesterday, who wants to advise her boss and tries it once and gets by with it, and tries it twice and doesn't get by with it - not that there aren't many ways that can help. She's a little queen, you know, and not the queen of the cookstove throne either; a queen in a new and magnificent world where queenliness is not recognized. There are many things that can be done by way of sublimation, and many a thing that can be read - that's what novels are about, to take up those aggressions of men in domestic ways. That's the reason I asked yesterday, in one of the sections, have any novels been written about the forestry work in America. That would be the greatest single contribution of this problem - or any problem in any department - to have a great artist prepare in sublimated form the beauty of these little things that when we meet them face to face they irritate us because we don't see them in perspective; so we could see them in the shadow of the trees and in the light of the sun, and under the unfailing fulfillment of romance of the moon and the stars. Ah! science, play, external friendships - these are ways of taking out what cannot be taken out in action, in detective stories, because sooner or later in modern life you're going to want to murder somebody, and by golly there are plenty of them that ought to be murdered - there is no doubt about that. The great Negro poet, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, had it, and who better would have known it than a Negro - "I know there is a heaven. Day by day the upward yearning of my soul has told me so; I know also there is a hell for if there were not, pray where would my neighbors go."

Two or three years ago here when I was having these debates with my good friend and dear enemy, Robert A. Taft, on the Columbia Broadcasting System, I got in the habit of lunching each week with Jay Franklin. He was debating with some journalist at the time and we were comparing notes. One day my high school son here at the Woodrow Wilson said, "Do you know that your friend Jay Franklin (I wish Jay were here this morning so he could correct me if I don't get this story just right) Do you know your friend, Jay Franklin is the John Carter of these murder thrillers." I said, "that couldn't be. Sure, you're wrong about that." He said, "I'm sure I'm right about it." I said, "that simply couldn't be - you don't know Mr. Franklin, he's the most gentle, kindly and mousey-like man that you ever saw in your life. He speaks in a low voice, he's the son of a minister, he's a man of great culture, I know that couldn't be." "Well", he said, "It is." I said, "Let me have one of them." He had one, so he handed it to me. "Death on the White House Lawn", another "Death in the Senate Chamber". I think there was another one "Death in the State Department" - all of them deaths. I got it and read it. Next time I saw Jay I said, "You - you aren't John Carter, the --" "Oh yeah, sure, sure." I said, "By golly, that's one way to take it out - no wonder

you're so quiet." And he said, "Got to do something about it, you know."

More murders are prevented in this country by what happens to men and the growing number of women between Saturday afternoon and Monday morning through the pages of books where you can murder a guy that looks enough like the one you were going to murder, so you sort of take it out on the first page, and quite thoroughly before you reach the 100th page, and you can come back in a pretty decent humor on Monday morning, with the aggressions that are natural and inevitable, fairly well sublimated.

Humor is a great thing, you know, in the world if you're looking for sublimation. If you could just see yourself, as William Vaughn Moody, the poet, puts it about a man who got pretty tight and decided to go down to the Zoo. And he went down to the Zoo and was looking at all the animals - this poem is called "A Monagerie" - you ought to look it up some time. Its not a great poem, but its a great philosophic document. He looked at all of them; none of them intrigued him until he came to the old chimpanzee - there the old boy was gripping the bars, looking at him with those mournful eyes. Some say a smile, but as William Cullen Bryant long ago said, "I think its an expression of mournful melancholy over the degeneracy of his descendants when he looks at them." He braced himself, standing there, and he saw through those misty eyes of the old chimp the whole panorama of evolution unrolled from the primordial slime and finally the reel ran off in his imagination and he suddenly realized that - you were last, and now I'm it, the end of creation. William Vaughn Moody says, "He looked at himself and he saw a little man in trousers, slightly jagged." That's all you are. Maybe in skirts, slightly jagged on your own words, or your own egotism, or your own aspirations.

But the work of the world has to be done. The tasks of work are not tasks of primary ideals, they are tasks of primary evils. You've sifted them down from the billions of things that you can feel and wish the world could be like that, to the millions of things that can be thought and you wish the world could be rational, to the thousands of things that can be said, and to the dozens of things that can be planned. This is that narrow bottle neck into practice, through which the birth of all the ideals must painfully flow before you can ever have any collective action at all. Seeing that how difficult it is to agree on things, how little of the ideal can ever be put into collective action, or any kind of action for that matter. That itself is the only certain way to introduce a feeling of magnanimity and friendliness in the task at hand around the decisions of superior or the performances of the inferior in the hierarchy of organizational life. That can't always do it - there are wrongs to be righted unquestionably, but for every wrong that can be righted there's a million that can't be righted and ought not to be undertaken even to be righted. But the main thing is for men themselves to be custodians of their thoughts and of their feelings, but for those who direct the work to be custodians of the job. And only as we can center ourselves around the job and make a life while we are making a living, and that can be done only with these infinite sublimations and external things, can we ever get ahead with the job that's bad enough even at best and that none of us would do unless it had to be done.

Here we are caught up in a relationship and certain work has to be done. It has to be planned and all the best is left out before the plans are finished because the best is that part of the plan which each person contributed, particularly himself. But the other contributed his best and so all of the best is left out. And what the plan of action is only the lowest common denominator even of the ideals that can be put into words and that isn't many.

Seeing that, if one can be intrigued with what he is doing or she is doing, if you can see that job in the light of its own tragic evolution, he will not demand of the actual in action the impossibilities that belong to thought and ideals, but there is a field for romance and we are all romantic things, thank God; there is a field for liberty and we are all free; there is a field for equality and we are all equal; there is a field, but more limited, for fraternity because even in the dearest dreams of the most benevolent institutionalized organs and hierarchies of religion its not all heaven which fraternity would require, its heaven and hell.

That's the reason I said in the beginning that fraternity is an impossible ideal. The sooner we forget it, the sooner we'll get away from Communism and from Fascism, for they are the glorifications of the fraternity ideal; and the sooner we recognize in democracy that its only the degree of fraternity which can be achieved in the name of equality and with due reference to liberty - only that degree of fraternity - that's not an utterly romantic ideal.

So I say to you in closing, on the topic itself, "What is the Place of Democracy in the Department Structure, what does this offer to the Government employee" - It offers to him all that it offers to any other citizen caught up in the business of making a living. It offers him a wide field, as broad as his own culture for imagination, as broad as his own discipline for thought; as broad as his own achievement for expression of that thought and as broad as courtesy allows and the job itself permits, of putting all of those to the service of the job itself, but that isn't far. And in the next, "To what extent should he renounce his freedom of thought?" Not at all. Freedom of speech -- a good deal. Freedom of action -- nearly all. For we are engaged in a job to be done, about which those who plan it directly are doing the best they can. If they're wise they'll welcome suggestions about it, but most of the suggestions won't be any good, because all of human capacity in the democratic process that we have, that goes in from the people back home through the legislature down to the final departmental plan, everything that you'll ever think of has already been thought of and debated. I say that humbly, because when I went to Congress a lot of my friends made me think maybe I was a great guy -- that as a professor of philosophy I had something to contribute to the nation nobody else would think of. Well, I pay my silent and vocal testimony to my colleagues in Congress by saying that during the years I sat in the House, and as a new member, often sat silently and listened, there was never an issue, never one, that by the time the debates in the committee and the House were over, I honestly believed I had anything to contribute that had not already been contributed. And that surprised me. But I'm grateful for that experience. Most of the things dictated by our

emotions in terms of the billions, or by thoughts in terms of the millions, or even by our formulations into speech in terms of the thousands can equally well, and have equally well, been presented in the narrowing field toward action long before it gets to us -- so let's not be too romantic about that. In action the job has to be done, and the best way is to see that job centrally and then see it in this larger light and know that its much more important to get something done than it is to do exactly the right thing, for who knows what exactly the right thing is? But in terms of speech, courtesy and consideration is the only rule of life anywhere in the world. The person who knows good manners will in 999 cases out of a thousand, with a boss or with an employee, get by with all that's fertile in freedom of speech in the work relationship. Beyond that lies the illimitable domain of thought.

"Better is thought than gems or gold,
And Oh thought never dies
But it will glow when the sun grows cold
Mixed with Deity."

And beyond that stretches the, as yet, unexplored heritage of human fancy and human feeling in which the humblest of us can roam completely at will and discover for ourselves the only elevated meaning that life ever has for anybody in the world -- I don't care what their power.

"There was a Daschund once, so long,
He hadn't any notion
How long it took to notify
His tail of his emotion.
And so it happened while his eyes
Were filled with woe and sadness
His little tail went wagging on
Because of previous gladness."

When the exigencies of action do not permit the glad immediate intonation of our thoughts and our feelings let us live on dreams of our achievements yesterday more than on hope of what we'll be able to do tomorrow. For we won't do much more tomorrow than today. And in the light of an imaginative understanding of the small role of action in the world, though an indispensable role, let us as cultured citizens of a great domain of freedom, find the meaning of our lives more and more where it actually is, in the field of free expression - a good deal limited everywhere; in the field of thought, almost completely unlimited, except by nature; and in the field of feeling, completely unlimited, except by your own capacities.

My fellow Buroaucrats: Nature hath not made us like her other creatures merely for peopling of her spacious kingdoms, beasts of the field, insects of the summer, breeding and dying, but also that we might, half knowing, worship the deathless beauty of her guiding vision and learn to love 'mid all things active and mortal that also which is imaginative, and thereby return.

The Department Program: What the Employee Should Know About It
Assistant Secretary Hill

I am happy to meet and talk with you. You are an important part and are enlisted in the services of the United States Department of Agriculture. It is your Department. It performs many many services for the greatest nation and the most wonderful people that exist.

This Department started from a meager and restricted beginning and has developed to where it affects the daily lives of nearly all the people in the nation. Its work constantly prepares our people for national defense. Our defense program didn't commence last year. It has grown and developed for many years. It is fortunate that it has, because this present hour of need calls for the best that is in us.

If you wait until emergency hits you and then try to get ready, confusion and delay are bound to occur. I said awhile ago that you were a part of the Department of Agriculture. We must all realize that we are first part of the army of the Department. The Department is divided into several units and bureaus for administrative purposes. The Forest Service and the BAE are among those units.

I would like to talk to you for a few moments about some of the programs of our Department. Within the past year, we have become the largest lenders of money in the nation, through our Farm Credit unit. We have become the second largest distributors of electricity, through the REA, and we are now, through the Lend-Lease purchases, the largest purchasers of food. We are fast becoming and are the leaders in the movement for better nutrition and better housing, and through our mattress program more than three million mattresses have been made. This is more mattresses than anyone else has ever made; yes, more than the Army and the Navy combined.

Our food experts are recognized as the outstanding authorities on food.

Food, housing, beds, clothing, electricity and credit--yes, we are playing a big and important part in the life of the nation. We have representatives in every county and nearly all the communities of the nation, men and women well and especially trained for the work they are doing.

Perhaps the greatest single piece of legislation passed in your or my lifetime was the Farm Credit Act, which gave to the agricultural industry interest rates comparable to those enjoyed by other industries, giving farmers at the same time credit arrangements which were suited to their needs.

I mention this as perhaps the most important; however, it is only one of a great many important advancements that all go to make up the great agricultural movement that has grown up within the last quarter of a century.

So beneficial have these advances been that this emergency has found agriculture ready and well-prepared; yes, better prepared than any other industry in all the nation.

You may say, "What has my job got to do with all this? What part does my bureau play in this movement?" The BAE and the Forest Service, of which you are a part, play a very important role. We never do anything very important by ourselves. We are important only in connection with others. No man or woman would be important if they were alone on an island and never left there. It takes many people to make a great movement work, and the work each does is important and must be done and done well, or the movement fails in that proportion.

I think this is illustrated by the old story, "For the want of a nail the shoe was lost; for the want of a shoe the horse was lost; for the want of a horse the messenger was lost; and for the want of a messenger, the army was defeated."

To those of you who serve in the BAE, I want to say that you are in a work that perhaps touches more intimately every phase of the work of the Department than any other agency in our set-up. Your duties are so varied and many that I will not have the time to mention them. You are taking on new work and new duties constantly. No important conference can or should be held without representatives of your bureau. To you has been assigned the wonderful opportunity of planning for the future, of looking into the mysteries of the future.

You become, in a way, a pilot of the ship, and, surveying the past and the future, you help steer a straight course, keeping the people informed as to what has been done in the past, the supplies of the present, and the probable attainments of the future. You have a right to be proud of the work you are in.

In some of the very new programs, the work that the Forest Service has been doing over the years is coming in mighty handy--for instance, the REA, which, by the way, is headed by a former Forest Service employee, Harry Slattery. The poles on which the transmission lines are strung come from the forest. The work that has been done over the years in protecting the plants and trees and grass on the mountains keeps the great power dams from silting up and becoming useless. This is very important, as these great reservoirs store the water not only to produce electricity, but to irrigate the fertile land in the valleys below, producing the food and the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of our people. This helps make our nation strong.

Protecting our forests from fires, the Forest Service serves our lumber supply upon which we depend. I have time to mention only a few of the valuable and important things that are being done and that have been done. The protection of the forests has furnished grazing for more than two million head of livestock which goes to feed our people.

Each and every one of you should make it your aim to know all the things your agency does, and why they are done. Nothing could be more interesting. The more you know about a task, the easier it is to perform, and the happier you will be in performing it. Most any task would be dull and uninteresting if we had no knowledge of what we were doing the work for.

Great joy comes from work when we can conceive of the good the work may do when performed.

The diamond cutter at his wheel gets joy from his work as he visualizes the brilliant social affairs which the diamond will make more brilliant as a result of his skill and handiwork in polishing it into a perfect jewel. It takes visions like this to bring men to that state of perfection and care necessary to do work of this nature.

The artist is brought to his state of perfection and skill as he visualizes the joy that will come to the multitudes when they stand before his canvas and admire his handiwork. We never think of an artist doing his work merely as a job, simply because we have never reached that state of perfection.

An artist must know about the subject he paints, and this is true of any work we do. A great picture is created through knowledge, and a good job is done through knowledge as well.

There is a great deal more satisfaction for a stenographer taking dictation and writing a letter on a subject about which she is well-informed. The letter becomes something more than merely setting down meaningless words. It becomes something she knows about, and she knows what part that letter is going to take in the whole pattern of the work around her.

We should not only be acquainted with our particular agency. We should know about and familiarize ourselves with the programs of the other units of the Department.

You, the same as all of us, are representatives of the Department of Agriculture. Your attitude and knowledge and feeling towards it form the opinions of those with whom you come in contact. If you are not proud and happy to be connected with the United States Department of Agriculture, something is wrong. There is an obligation on you to represent your Department well at all times. You are not just average people. You have been carefully selected for your special work. Using the Biblical quotation, "Many are called but few are chosen."

There is a higher and a nobler obligation and responsibility that rests on you, especially at this time--the responsibility as a citizen of the greatest nation on earth. You are all citizens of this country; otherwise, you would not be in the positions you are in. It is proper that your work be done by loyal Americans.

If there are those among you who have no other interest than your salary or fail to take a pride and satisfaction in the accomplishments of our Department, you are missing some of the very finest things in life. You are missing the joy of accomplishment.

In this world it principally depends on ourselves as to what we do. Others may help us some, but the things we do, and what we accomplish, depend largely on the enthusiasm, study, and work that we put into our endeavors.

I have given much time and study to the past accomplishments of the Department, and am familiar with the endeavors of the present, and I am proud and happy to be associated with you in this work.

oOo

COMMENTS

The vivid review of the present world situation - political and belligerent - by Father Walsh - added to the statement of Dr. Ross, gives a fairly complete "whole", but certainly a dark and foreboding picture for the philosopher to contemplate. (Ross) A world destroying its primary resources on which population depends - yet its peoples are fighting each other in a colossal war which ultimately goes back to population pressures (caused by resource shortage); one group teaching class hate and another race superiority. These two things, class hate and race superiority, are only rationalizations, excuses - the success of neither would affect the real cause.

But that is not all: (Walsh) Freedom is not the distinguishing note of democracy. Equality (except legal) is a dangerous ideal to be purchased only with liberty; security for the masses is likewise a dangerous ideal - it may backfire and destroy us. Security should be approached slowly, cautiously, and with extreme care. Fraternity likewise is a delusion, a figment of the mind, a beautiful dream but an impossibility. In other words, they leave us a world without equality or fraternity, with restricted liberty, with the "have nots" fighting the "haves" perpetually, periodically, because there never will be enough "haves" for all.

(Smith) The Creator, foreseeing this situation, as the result of his having granted freedom of choice, provided us also with imagination. It is not a cure but a refuge. With it we are able to "sublimate" the things as they should be and make the best of evils we cannot help.

This is perhaps an over-simplified statement, but we believe a true statement of the over-all, total situation as given by Ross, Walsh and Smith.

In the midst of that fatalistic concept we find the Department of Agriculture, a very small dot on the total picture, trying to protect, preserve and develop - to save - the base resources, to increase production where needed, to facilitate distribution, and thus to relieve pressures.

Within the Department we find a little group (about 500) of employees with this picture before them, exploring the possibility of a new philosophy or an expansion of their own that will extend the idea of democracy (participation) from the political, certainly, to the managerial, the social, the industrial, and possibly even to the economic phases of life relationships. And while outsiders questioned, the employees themselves took it for granted that their objective - not to get more, but to give more - was accepted; perhaps to get more in opportunities for service, and in a feeling of equality of purpose, more liberty in offering one's might, and above all, a fraternity of feeling even though we are assured it is "a million times more than can be done."

That is why one comment, previously quoted, called the school a "shot in the arm." It was stimulating and uplifting, and enthusiasm continued to mount.

DISCUSSIONS

The discussions the second day were more unified and there was more enthusiastic, and more general participation. In practically every group there was discussion of the difference in point of view between Father Walsh and Dr. Smith, and some of the groups asked Smith to explain it further. Also, there was considerable discussion of Smith's meaning when he said, "for it is one of the symptoms of the spiritual dilemma of our time that it has been left to those who are, (as he put it), 'the apostles of hate' to become 'the voice of the everlasting yea of men.'" It was finally agreed that those accused of teaching hate did not in reality teach hate of people but only hate of special privilege, and that the "yea" they taught was hope and opportunity and a full, worthwhile life for the masses. Some still doubted whether Smith was right.

The most discussed question was whether or not democracy (meaning as defined by Father Walsh, participation) could be applied outside the political field. In this there was no thought that Departmental programs should be determined by a majority vote of employees. As to that, programs are now set by Congress, and the congressmen are selected by a majority vote so that phase is already taken care of democratically. But that phase was ignored. Democracy in the Department was considered to mean participation in the phases of administration which immediately concern the individual's job and about which he knows something and therefore has something to contribute. All discussion recognized organizational responsibilities, and no one suggested substituting majority rule, but all felt there was still an enormous field open for participation. Perhaps the size of the field depended some on the acceptance of "participation" rather than "majority rule" as the definition. All recognized that the "boss" (at all levels) makes decisions; also, that he does not make them out of nothing. He makes them right oftener when his employees participate in developing the basis for the decision.

In one group an employee said she had heard of a Division which maintained a "question and suggestion" box, and that once a week the Chief opened the box and discussed its contents together with the work (plans and progress) with the Division employees, even stenographers and file clerks. She posed the question as to whether or not the Division Chief was attempting to side-step his responsibility for running the Division or whether it was really good management.

The question was carried forward to the general discussion group. There the discussion developed that it was not only good but clever management; that the Chief did not, and did not need, to take a vote. The employee recognized his place in the group, but further, when all the facts were out in the open and understood, all agreed (usually) as to the right thing to do. When there was important disagreement it meant that there was not complete understanding. On this basis many suggestions were accepted and others rejected without a vote.

Another question which it seems every group discussed was Dr. Smith's

idea that one necessarily must get most of life's satisfactions outside of the work situation; that the requirements of the job should be accepted, not fought, and one's mind and life should be given to other things that will satisfy.

Most participants were unable to accept this philosophy. They believed it possible to, and they believed that one should, get a great deal of life's satisfactions from the job itself; when such a belief is recognized and worked for, a great deal, perhaps more than we realize, can be done in making the job yield more lasting satisfactions.

One group asked Smith to further explain his position. He said that, speaking without experience, it seemed to him that in this age of extreme specialization there were many jobs such as punch card machine operation, for example, that just did not carry anything in themselves of interest or creative opportunity. He felt sure, however, that a great deal more could be done than is being done to make work interesting and give it the constructive values we all instinctively crave; that the employee as well as management must help in bringing this about. And in doing this, imagination on the part of both will help.

Some of the other questions proposed or discussed were:

"To what extent should we be satisfied with our lot?"

"What were the real differences between Father Walsh's and Dr. Smith's points of view?"

"How can we bring about a more favorable attitude of the public toward government employees?"

"How can we make the idealist himself feel more of an insider in the service?"

"How can the organization best use employee initiative?"

Several questions revolved around the idea that the employee desired and should have the opportunity to go to the boss and talk freely and helpfully.

The central theme in all ten groups was "participation" in and satisfaction in the work situation and its relationships, and the great interest and enthusiasm of the School came from the fact that employees were asked to discuss freely with no restrictions, and to express their opinions on important and fundamental questions. As more than one clerk said, "I have worked here for more than 20 years and this is the first time I have been asked for my opinion as if it were important."

October 3.

Subject: Adjustments

Lectures

Orienting the Forest Service Program with the Democratic
and Economic Background Presented - Dr. Clapp

It is a great pleasure to meet this group of people, those of the Forest Service and other Bureaus in the Department; and particularly to meet an audience having so many women in it. All of us have plenty of opportunities to talk to the men in our own organizations and those of other Bureaus, but relatively few to talk to the women.

It is rather difficult, or very difficult, for us now to visualize the world forces that were arrayed against the democratic form of government when, 150 years or more ago, we were trying to establish our own democratic form of government. Possibly, or probably, most of the governments of the world were against us, but the United States was then a very small and inconsequential country in the eyes of most of the world, and very remote. It was almost out of the question for most countries to do anything about it, and I suppose that in a real sense we escaped by default.

The present situation is very different. Groups of gangsters have seized the governments of strong military countries and are determined to destroy all democracies, including our own; and distances have shrunken so much that it ought to be a much easier thing to reach us.

Now I take it that most of you will agree that it is easier to maintain a democracy if we have an abundance of natural resources, and it would be easier to maintain a democracy if this abundance of resources is actually used to further desirable standards of living; desirable standards for the rank and file of the people, and not for the privileged few alone. The time has probably passed when any people will indefinitely support a democracy if that democracy is a mere abstraction. And there is a far better chance for a democracy to succeed and be lasting if it means all the things that contribute to a decent way of life. The United States has been very fortunate in one of the first attempts to build up a great democracy because nature furnished on the American continent an abundance of many natural resources. A large area of very rich soil, most of the minerals needed in civilization, water, and not least among these great natural resources, forests.

It is undoubtedly true that many of the things in our form of government and our institutions for which man claims the credit, should actually be credited to the resources which were found here, and which have been used so lavishly. And let's not be too sure that what has happened in the past may not happen in the future also.

I am to speak to you today on how to make our forests contribute to the American democracy. And I believe that forests are vital to the United States, if not indispensable. I think we have reached the time when we will have to have positive assurance that our forests will contribute in a maximum degree to the permanence of our democracy.

Now at the risk of covering ground with which most of you, if not all of you in this audience are familiar, I want to refer very briefly and sketchily to the forest resource, how it is made up, and how complex it really is.

First of all, the forest is made up of the land itself, the land which grows the forest - the basic soil resource. About a third of the land area, as most of you know, of the United States, is now classed as forest land. Perhaps the size of this area can be made a little more concrete by comparing it with some other areas. It is about as large as the entire area east of the Mississippi, with a plot of about one hundred million acres left over. It exceeds the combined areas of France, Germany before Munich, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Netherlands and the British Isles. And it is nearly twice as large as the area under cultivation in the United States. Now this area of forest land is made up of land that can't, in the main, be used at all, or can't be used effectively for any other purposes than forests. And to me it is inconceivable that such a vast area can't be used for the benefit of our people and for the preservation of our democracy. And it is equally inconceivable that failure to use this land can be otherwise than seriously detrimental. So much for the land, one of the resources which make up the forest resource.

Then there is the forest itself, or the timber. Now nearly three fourths of our area of forest land is capable of producing commercial timber crops and is available for that purpose, and wood, as you all know, has been used and will continue to be used for literally thousands of uses: shifting, changing all the time, the number probably increasing. Lumber in a multitude of forms, lumber, paper, railroad ties, poles, piling, veneer wood, mining timber, fuel and a long and growing list. And this forest resource reaches people by furnishing large means of employment, in the growing of timber, in the harvesting of timber, in manufacturing it in a number of forms, and finally in its actual use. One of the most valuable aspects of the forest is that it is renewable in perpetuity. So much for three fourths of the land and one of the resources that make up the forests. The other one fourth of the forest land will not produce commercial timber crops, but it is still valuable for a number of other purposes, which I am going to mention now.

Protection of water sheds is one of the most valuable services which the forest renders, and you can almost call it a resource in itself. Nearly three fourths of all of our forest land is important for this purpose, including the prevention of erosion, the control of run-off, the prevention of floods and such things as that. This is rather a difficult service, or contribution, to measure in some respects, but taken in the large it rivals and probably exceeds in value the values which may be obtained from the trees or the timber which we ordinarily think of as making up the forests.

Forest ranges are still another resource which help to make up the forest, and nearly half of the entire forest area is valuable for that purpose, mainly in the west, but also in a rather important way in the south.

Then practically our entire forest area is suitable for wildlife, and many of our wildlife species, and especially the larger ones, which formerly lived in the open plains have been crowded back into the forest. Just a little illustration of how this touches the people - in 1936 about 17 million people hunted and fished.

Then the forest furnishes an exceptional opportunity for outdoor recreation, one of the services, almost a resource. Outdoor recreation is increasingly important, helping man to adjust himself to an increasingly complex and mechanized civilization; helping man to catch up with a civilization which he himself has built. Then just as one example of the extent of the use of the forest for recreation, in the national forests alone, (and the National forests form only a fraction of the total forest area) there were something like 38 million visitors in 1940. Nearly half of them stopped to enjoy some form of forest recreation. And that number would be vastly increased by including National and State and local parks and other forest areas.

Now all of these phases or parts of the forest resources contribute directly or indirectly in innumerable ways to the life of human beings; to their work and income and livelihood; to a wide range of products for the use of man; and to means of enjoyment. Taken all together, there is no question but that forests in one way or another, directly or indirectly, reach the life, and benefit the life of every citizen of the United States every day of his entire life.

I would like to spend just a very few minutes in discussing what we have done with the forest heritage which our forefathers found on the American continent. We have cleared millions of acres for cultivation. That was necessary and justified, except that in some cases we have made the mistake of clearing lands which are submarginal for cultivation, and a sizeable area of this character must sooner or later go back into forests. Then we have cut over once or several times, or burned destructively, all but about 65 million acres, and this area of virgin forest is largely in the west, and the east may have only a few museum pieces left. Most of the cut-over area has been burned once or many times, so that the value of the forest has been diminished. Nearly 80 million acres have been cut or burned so destructively that it is devastated and must be classed as idle land. Then there are millions of additional acres (no one knows just how many there are) that have been depleted so that the land is only partially productive, producing only a quarter or a third or a half of the timber that it might easily produce. We are now cutting our forests, all of our forests, considerably faster than they are growing, about fifty percent faster than the effective growth, the growth that may be used at some time in the future. We are cutting our high grade material, the larger, more valuable material, which takes the longest time to grow, at almost double the effective rate of growth.

Putting it in another way, we are cutting our second growth forests just about as fast as they are growing, holding them down to what they are now, and we are still cutting rapidly into our virgin forests.

Another measure of how we stand: We have left about 1750 billion feet board measure of saw timber, that is, the large size, high-grade material, and three fourths of this is old growth, and only one fourth is second growth; much of the second growth is volunteer, so that man can't claim any credit for having produced that.

Now on top of all the past history of cutting we have a defense situation which has greatly increased the cutting of forest products all over the United States. The drain on all of our forests has increased on second growth and virgin forests alike, and in many parts of the country buyers are scouring the country, buying every little patch of timber large enough to cut. They are buying it and cutting it. Small sawmills have sprung up by the thousands. Mills have been pulled out of the junk heap and put into operation again. Of course we must meet defense requirements, but it can be done constructively, and unfortunately most of the cutting that is now going on is destructive.

I don't want to give the impression that there has been no progress, because we have made progress on our forest problem. It began haltingly about fifty years ago and has progressed all too slowly. We have our National forests for example, in which we are giving the best administration of all the resources that we can with the facilities available, and we are trying to serve as effectively as we can the four million people who live in and near these forests. State and community forests are being managed with more or less intensity.

But the main area of forest land is in private ownership -- and it is the best land. Two-thirds of it is important for watershed protection. It furnishes over 95% of the present day timber cut. What's happened to those forests? Well, a part of them are owned by forest industries, and only about 15% of forest land owned by the forest industries is under any form of management whatever, and 85% is receiving practically no care to perpetuate the forests. The record on farm-owned forests is somewhat better, but taking the industrially-owned and the farm-owned forests together only about 20 percent is under any conscious form of management or care, and 80 percent is without care. I have left protection against fire in a somewhat different category, and there is an area nearly as large as the national forests which today is not receiving even the primary requisite of all forests, protection against fire.

So that in spite of all the work that has been done and all the progress that has been made the major part of the forest job is ahead, and the most critical part is that on lands which are in private ownership.

So much for the timber, and I could tell a similar story about the other resources, but I want to pass on to the effect which the past use and neglect has had on human beings. I could sum it up in about this way: The

most of the worst rural problem areas in the United States, not all, but most of them, are in our forest regions, and in regions where the forests have been more or less seriously depleted. It took the recent depression to bring that situation glaringly into the open. We have realized it before but the depression brought it out so that no one could escape it. There are lots of examples of this sort of thing -- I'll give a few, and these are depression figures. In one of the southern Appalachian counties the farmers had an average cash income of \$114.00, that is, per family, and 20 percent of the families had an income of less than \$40.00. Take a county in the Missouri Ozarks -- the cash income of the farmers ranged from \$119.00 to \$190.00. Take another example in the Lake States -- 63 percent of the farmers in 24 cut-over counties in northern Wisconsin had a cash income in 1937 of less than \$100.00. Now I could give you examples, hundreds of them, from different parts of the country, the East, the South, the middle West, and even the far West, and I could give you examples from rural villages and towns in addition to those from the farms.

But to sum up the whole situation again, a recent and a rather rough estimate indicated that nearly one fourth of the land area of the United States (that includes forest and cultivated land) is in this rural problem area class in forest regions with more or less seriously depleted forests. Conditions are probably better now, with the opportunity for employment in connection with national defense, but we have to think of the post-war period when people will drift back to those regions -- these problem area regions -- and then the resources on which they will have to depend will be in poorer condition to meet their needs than they were during the last depression.

Now what are we going to do about it? If natural resources in abundance are an essential in democracy what are we going to do to insure forests in abundance? If regions of depleted forests are, in general, rural problem areas and if nearly one fourth of our land area is in the rural problem class what are we going to do about that? Isn't it necessary in the interest of democracy that something be done?

I have made the prediction which I want to repeat now, that these rural problem areas will not, in spite of everything else that can and should be done, be brought back into satisfactory condition until the forests are restored.

We in the Forest Service, and I want to add my personal feeling on this, have reached the profound conviction that the time has come to stop temporizing with the natural resource forest problem and the social problem that is closely related to it, and to advocate measures which give the most positive assurance that both the forest problem and the dependent social problems will be solved.

And there are only two measures which we can think of, and which the history of forestry in the whole world has developed, that give that positive assurance that the forest problem and the related social problem will be met. And both will require bold, courageous action. Action comparable

to that which was taken 50 years ago when Congress authorized the setting aside of National forests from lands which were in the public domain; comparable with that taken 30 years ago when Congress authorized the purchase of lands for National Forests. Both actions were bold and courageous in the face of public opinion of those days, and we require bold and courageous action now.

There are only two measures, to repeat, which give this positive assurance and the first of these is public regulation of forest practices on privately-owned lands. Such regulation would set a floor, or a minimum below which practices might not go, and that minimum would be designed to stop further destruction of the forests; to stop further deterioration and to keep the lands reasonably productive. Public regulation of forest practices on private lands need not be, and should not lead to a dictatorship, but I believe that it can help to preserve and enhance democracy by giving some of the people who need it most a stake in our democracy. Some of the opponents of public regulation say that the whole plan would be undemocratic if the Federal government does the job. But they say it would be democratic if the states did the job, and one reason they say that is because they feel that they could control the regulatory machinery in the states. That is the first of the two measures which give positive assurance that our forests in private ownership will be well taken care of.

The second is a greatly increased scale of public ownership. Now there are millions of acres of forest lands in the United States which are submarginal for any private ownership, and if they are to be well taken care of the public will have to do the job itself. And then there are additional large areas where the public interest involved is so great, the public needs are so acute, that the public interest will not be met under private ownership, and the lands will have to be taken over by the public if the public interest is to be served. I doubt if there are very many people today who would say that our National forests are undemocratic or that they are a threat to our democracy, but 50 years ago they said they would be a threat to democracy. Personally I can't see any threat to democracy in public ownership and administration of this natural resource which is so vital to the public interest. The real threat, as said before, is in the destruction of the resource, not its maintenance.

Now these two measures should be supplemented because a large area is now in private ownership, a large area which will remain in private ownership. They should be supplemented by public cooperation with private owners in the rather large and diversified number of ways: Public aid in protection of forest lands against fire, against insects and disease; in finding out how, and telling private forces how to handle their lands; in cooperatives which will help to solve the problems of the handicapped small owners who are not in a position to help themselves; in credits adapted to the character of the forestry undertaking, and in numerous other ways.

So the program the Forest Service advocates includes three points or groups of activities; through public regulation and through greatly increased public ownership to give positive assurance that public interest will be protected, and then public cooperation with private owners to help private owners do the job which is left for them. That program we believe will keep our forest lands productive; make them productive where they are not now productive, and it will help to provide a decent way of life for millions of people who live on the land and who are directly dependent upon it, and that is the crux of the whole thing.

In the years following the present war we are going to need all the resources and all the opportunities we have or can create, to make our democracy what it should be, and the one-third of our land area which is best suited for forests can and should make a sizable contribution to that objective.

Has Democracy a Universal, Workable Philosophy of Human Relationships
in a Complex World? -- Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

(Talk given from notes and not edited)

I think the subject is quite a large subject for a rather short talk, so I hope you are going to forgive me if I make it very simple. 'Has Democracy a Universal Workable Philosophy of Human Relations in a Complex World?' Well, of course it depends on just how you define democracy. If you think democracy is one static thing which you can put into words which will remain the same today, tomorrow or the next day then I don't think it has. If, however, you think that democracy is a method by which, if people preserve their freedom they can express themselves, then I think it has, because it can then be made to meet whatever changes occur in the thinking of the majority of the people. As a matter of fact you are very apt to confuse what we at this time think democracy stands for and the actual means by which we practice democracy.

The one thing which has really created dictatorships is the taking away from people in any country their opportunity to express themselves at the polls and the continuing determination that the majority expression shall be followed out in the government or the philosophy of life that governs that country until there is an expression again of popular opinion when they may change forms or circumstances of new thinking and the majority opinion may be different. But the thing which really preserves your freedom is that ability to express your thinking of the moment - and the important thing about it is that your thinking can change and that therefore people in the minority need never feel that they are not being fairly treated because they have every opportunity through education, through telling people, and persuading people of what they believe, to change that minority into a majority; but the fact that you live under the decision of a majority of the people is what is important in the democratic functioning of any government.

Now we very often forget that that is the basic thing. I think that the definition of democracy is what we want to have it. Now, it is not always going to be that way; that our conception of the government we want, and way of life we want must be set by what we think today. As a matter of fact I don't believe that would be safe at all. Our greatest safeguard is this constant exercise of the right of the people to express their changing opinion at the polls and the acceptance of the people as a whole of the decision at the polls. If you couldn't have that you would have a constant use of force, and the group that happened to be strongest -- physically strongest -- would always have the upper hand. So that is the really important thing for all of us to preserve. You may not like the decision of the majority -- you may dislike it very much, but don't throw it over because it is your safeguard. If you get people to change their minds; if your thinking is better than theirs and if you believe that people are capable of governing themselves and of thinking through and changing their minds, then your safeguard is that people do accept the will of the majority and do not use force.

It seems to me that we sometimes become too impatient. We want to see the things which we believe should happen, happen before we have gone

through the Democratic process which is the process of convincing people through persuasion, through education, that certain things should happen for the benefit of the majority of the people and letting them try it out. Letting them find out whether their thinking is straight or whether it is in any way at fault. To those of us who sometimes think certain ideas should hold sway, it seems as though the Democratic process is pretty slow sometimes. But we mustn't feel that way, because that is our fundamental safeguard. We must be willing to recognize the fact that the Democratic process depends upon the understanding of the people and their ability to accept certain ideas and believe in and make themselves conform to their beliefs. It is one thing, of course, to believe in theories -- quite another thing to actually be willing to put those theories in practice. And that, I think, is one of the things that makes us wonder sometimes whether it is possible in the world as we see it today to actually have democracy work.

In the first place, it requires an educated people. It requires a people who can read - who can inform themselves; that really are able to listen to arguments and are sufficiently open minded to weigh arguments. Occasionally I get very amusing letters. They show quite plainly that people who write them have no conception whatever of the obligations under which the citizen lives in a Democracy, because a citizen in a Democracy is obligated to listen to different points of view. He or she has absolutely no right to say, 'I won't listen to what somebody else thinks' - on any given subject, because that is your only way of growing; of seeing what must meet the new needs that may arise and of not being frozen into a pattern which ceases to meet the needs of a complex world.

Now, of course, the reason a certain number of people have been willing to accept dictatorship is because they were not willing to think for themselves and to take the responsibility which is ours if we accept the philosophy of a democratic form of government. I often think when I hear people say, 'Well, my representatives in Congress or my representatives in the State Legislature are such poor representatives they really never seem to understand what I really think they should do.' And then, instead of feeling a sense of personal responsibility about those representatives, those very same people will go out and vote for them again at the election, or they will not vote at all. I happen to know people who have been elected over and over again in a constituency, but I've heard criticisms of those people for years and yet the citizens never seem to feel that they have a responsibility either to see that their representatives know how they feel, or to change their representatives.

A democratic form of government, a democratic way of life presupposes, I think, free public education all through a long period of time; and it presupposes also an education for personal responsibility which I am afraid we often neglect; for instance, you are doing a thing here in trying to know your own program; trying to know what the ideas are that lie back of that program, which should be done not only here, but should be done in every community; about their own community and about all the government functions which touch the life of their community. Now I wonder how many communities that you reach into as representatives of the Forestry Service

really have the machinery which would make it possible for that community even to know what your work in their community means to them.

I happen to live in a rural area and I went into our village post-office and I found that a representative of your Department had an office there and I asked him, for the first time I wish you to know, what he was doing. I had no idea - and I think I am a pretty good citizen, on the whole - but I had no idea what he was doing, and then when he told me what he was doing I suddenly began to wonder whether he was doing enough; whether perhaps what he was doing was too concentrated on one particular thing; and then I began to inquire whether there were other people represented in your Department doing the other things which I had suddenly thought must happen; must be happening, but which I had never known anything about before, and I discovered the greatest number of things being done in my own county, and yet I had never known about them before. And that made me realize that we haven't begun to scratch the surface of making our people understand what it is to really function as an active citizen in a democracy because you ought to know everything that is being done in your community, either by government services or by other organizations and yet most of us work in the one thing, whatever it may be, or two things, and we don't realize our relationship to the other things. You can't spread yourself so that you work in everything and make a contribution; but you ought to know, because very often you would make a better contribution if you could bring together all these things and get an over all picture. And I am beginning to think that the most important thing that we can do in the development of a workable philosophy for the success of democracy is the awakening of every citizen to a real awareness of his own community, and through that awakening I think we will get the sense of responsibility that we need to make democracy function all the time. Now, it functions in spurts. Much of the time it becomes totally unconscious of what is happening in the field of government or even of the trend that people may be thinking is the way of life they wish to lead.

I have been very much amused in talking with a great many different people about Nazism, Fascism as it shows up in Italy and Spain; or Communism as it exists in Russia, because I don't think that anywhere does the individual have to shoulder as great a responsibility as the individual has to shoulder under a democratic form of government. And nowhere does the individual actually have the opportunity to express himself or herself and count in the area in which they live and in the over all decisions of what they want their State and Nation to do as they have if they really function under a democratic form of government.

What you are doing here is a very interesting thing because from your own knowledge you may be able to stimulate the interest of other people in studying the things that they touch and then you'll find yourself going out to all the other things in the community. Its endless, once you begin. You'll find that you never stop finding out new things. It's perfectly endless how many interesting things there are in the world. But I think right here in Washington we have the greatest opportunity for developing in our citizens as a whole a realization of what democracy which really functions, can mean to the people of our country and perhaps if it does mean what I

think it should mean to this country, it will mean something to the rest of the world. I think that we have a tremendous obligation today, because if we cannot show them that people can function in a democracy and that it is a workable form of government and a workable philosophy of life, then nowhere is it going to be acceptable, because we have the greatest opportunity to show that it can work.

Now, I am not satisfied, of course. Neither are you as you go through the country, with the extent to which we have really attained democracy in this country. Nobody can say that all of our people have a sense of responsibility and of understanding; or are even able, if they had that sense, to participate in the real functions of government. But we have it to a greater extent than any other nation in the world has it today, and we have what is even more important; the opportunity to extend it; the opportunity to make the changes as we recognize them as necessary. We have the opportunity to broaden; we have the opportunity to examine every situation, to use every form of communication, radio, press, contact, meetings with each other, the movies. We have innumerable ways, avenues for communication and education. We have a chance to make of our schools the places where we begin to have children understand what it means to really be a citizen in a democracy. We have many people who are trying to help young people to have a better understanding of their responsibilities and of their opportunities. We have a tremendous opportunity today.

I happened to be talking to someone the other night and she said, 'Well, of course I would not dream of undertaking this job if it wasn't that the emergency is so great at present, but I think by working in all the hours I have used for leisure, I'll be able to do the two jobs.' Well, that is a pretty tough thing to do and you would never do it except under the pressure of the feeling that your beliefs and convictions were at stake and that you owed it to your future stability to actually work for the things in which you actually believe.

I think if we all have that feeling we will come out of the present period, which is a very serious period, a very difficult period in every way for a great many people, but I think if we use it to the very best ability by giving all that we possibly can give to the development of our responsibility as citizens or individual responsibility we will come through this period with a better country here and perhaps a contribution which will be of value to the rest of the world. None of us know what may happen in other parts of the world because none of us know how people are going to react after the kind of strain they have been subjected to in the past few years. We do know that there are going to be enormous demands on us, material demands. You don't destroy all kinds of material things and not have demands on those who still have something which they have not destroyed when a period of readjustment comes. But you are also going to have enormous demands on your spiritual and mental capacities. You are going to be asked to understand people; to use your knowledge of history; to use your imagination in an effort to see what is happening to other people, in a way which never has been done before, and you are going to be asked to have faith to transmit that faith to other people who have lost that faith. You are going to be

asked to have faith in the capacity of human beings to think unselfishly - that's a pretty hard thing to have to face sometimes.

Every now and then I begin to think that there really is no such thing as thinking for other people as well as for yourself, but we are going to have to have faith in the ability of people to care about other people, and in the ability of people to grow; and only if we have that faith can we ever restore it, I think, to the rest of the world. And only if we have that faith and we begin again and try to build up ways in which we may have friendly relationships and perhaps avoid these conflagrations which destroy so much. I went through a period when I thought we never again would be stupid enough to have any great number of people involved in war. I have had to readjust all my thinking; I have had to readjust a great many of the things that I hoped we never would have to think about again. I think probably it is going to be very hard for many people to keep their own faith and try again to build toward the things which really do preserve freedom, not just for us, but for other people in the world, and which really do make it possible for democracy to function, and all the philosophy that lies back of giving people the right to peaceably make their own choices of how they grow - to make that philosophy really become something which actuates the great majority of people throughout the world.

That's a tremendous responsibility. I hope we are going to be able to do it, but we are not going to be able to do it unless we have faith in ourselves, faith in human beings as a whole and a very great courage to face any situation, no matter what it is, and find some way to meet that situation with honesty and with a spirit of fairness to people as a whole, and with the spirit of unselfishness in all willingness to carry the burdens of other people as well as our own. I thank you.

Developing a Personal Employee Life Philosophy

(Since the Recording was Faulty, Only an
Outline of Dr. Ross's Lecture is Attempted)

- I. Expansion of the responsibilities and services of your Government is as certain as anything future can be--especially of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.
- II. Very likely a number of you will have a power for good in nowise corresponding with the size of your salary.
- III. You in very subordinate positions, who feel small assurance of promotion, will find your work more inspiring if you go to the trouble of acquainting yourself with the need and the aims of the policies your section of the Department is engaged upon.
- IV. The assumptions and cardinal doctrines of the Pecuniary Culture (Veblen) are being rapidly outgrown by American intellectuals and those whom they influence. Less and less will you, who have heavy responsibilities and no little power but very modest stipends, be overshadowed and outshone in the eyes of the public by those who have a lot of money,
- V. High school and college attendances are reaching levels never before known in any society--which means that the number competent to appreciate the significance of what you people are doing is so great that you will be inspired as never before. The social climate in which you live and work is constantly becoming more suave and agreeable.
- VI. There can be no question that family is destined to play a smaller role in placing one socially; personality and personal worth will count for more. Lineage may some day regain its old importance, but certainly not in our time. We can see no cause that will bring back the old distinction between nobles and commonalty. Privileged hereditary social orders are likely to be out of the picture for a long time to come. Inheritance of social status cannot well recur until society again settles into a static phase. This cannot be until the flow of discoveries and inventions, now immense, shrinks to a mere trickle.
- VII. If Hitler loses, the decline of the importance attached to race will probably continue. The diffusion through practically all sections of humanity, of the most advanced and solidly based, of all existing cultures, viz., western culture, will have the effect of lessening the significance imputed to race. Individuals very unlike ourselves in hue and other physical traits will startle us by knowing Shakespeare and the Bible as well as we do! As higher educational opportunities are by means of scholarships, fellowships, and other aids, brought within the reach of gifted youth in all lands, it will be found that all, certainly nearly all, branches of the human species are producing individuals who are capable of making worthwhile contributions to some one of the various sciences. The diffusion through all peoples of the most solid elements of the more advanced culture will result in something like a leveling up of national cultures. As inevitable

result, in accounting for the marked differences in the historic performance and contributions of different peoples more weight will be given to cultural unlikeness and less weight to racial unlikeness. By no means do I assert the equality of races; but I do contend that many disparities in performance which have been laid to race difference will eventually turn out to be consequences of cultural differences.

VIII. The contact, competition and mutual interpenetrations of all extant cultures are destined to go on at a rate never before even approximated.

IX. In developing ones own life philosophy, and with it the art of life management, one must consider all of these foregoing factors and forces in their relationship to ones particular job in its particular environment, and work out for one's self an interpretative coordination; for the object of life management is to understand all the forces that affect ones life, and to learn to steer ones way thru them--using, deflecting, avoiding--to ones life objective and to life satisfaction. In doing this a touch of stoicism helps, also the art of sublimating, presented so realistically by a previous speaker.

COMMENTS

The lectures on this the third and last day presented so much new material of such high quality that they carried the School to still greater heights instead of bringing it back to a safe landing for the finish. Hence we were forced to close with a horde of new ideas, new thoughts, new points of view, and with practically no questions finally answered. Dr. Ross did make a remarkably fine summary, with suggestions for a life philosophy and the art of life management, but in the welter of new ideas they passed almost unnoticed at the time. One has to think -- long and hard -- to grasp fully his meaning. Passed over at the time, it will come back to us in periods of reflection and be a help at the time help is needed.

Dr. Clapp took the same position as was taken by Dr. Ross in his first lecture, that to preserve democracy we must preserve the basis resources on which a people must depend for the satisfaction of primary needs. If such a resource is destroyed or seriously impaired, the needs of the people will not be met; they will become restless, dissatisfied and then both liberty and democracy will be in danger.

He (Clapp) then discussed the present situation with respect to timber -- and told briefly just what must be done if deterioration is to be stopped and the resource preserved and developed. To many, even of the Forest Service, this phase of the story was new, and its setting in the school program helped to make it realistic and to give it new meaning and new understanding.

Mrs. Roosevelt's talk was a real contribution and fitted nicely into what had gone before both in the lectures and in the discussions. To be sure, she talked mostly about the place of democracy in political government. That was to be expected, both from her position and from the emphasis on government democracy in the present world situation. But those things do not limit her thinking. Take her first paragraph: If you believe that democracy is just one thing -- voting once a year or "majority rule" -- then democracy has no philosophy, but if you think of democracy as a method of participation, a way of life that can be adapted to changing situations and to all life's common functioning, then democracy has a philosophy, a workable philosophy. It is as adaptable to work situations as to government situations and it doesn't manifest itself in just one way.

But democracy goes beyond even such application, as was discussed the day before in several groups; it goes right down to participation in community life. Consider the potential field of thought and action which is suggested by her reference to her own community and how little she participated in it or even knew about it even though she did vote every year. It would take a lot of discussion to determine just where such thinking might lead.

Also, one is pleased to find a real leader with so large a following who recognizes that sometimes the followers must lead the leaders -- they at times perceive change or grasp fundamentals first.

Another thing she stressed is the need for education, education we take

it in all the things that affect group efforts or life, but particularly in this broader idea of democracy as a changing ideal not a fixed method. We are told that it would be dangerous to try to impose our idea of democracy on the future. "Ability to grow" is, it seems, more important than tradition. An inspiring thought. What is the limit of its meaning? Add to this the final theme of the concluding lecture and you have a fitting climax which justifies our title -- A School of Philosophy.

DISCUSSIONS

The discussions on the third and last day increased in interest, but the time was far too short to carry discussions through to conclusions or even discuss at all many of the interesting questions proposed. The discussions in all groups centered around new ideas proposed in the morning's lectures, but some of the old questions such as, "How can employees in the ranks best develop the background necessary to a belief in the importance of their work," "Should persons get enjoyment in their work or only on the outside," and "Can philosophy remedy the dissatisfaction of a misfit employee, or should the agency or superior assist that employee in getting another position" still persisted and still carried a great deal of interest.

The preponderance of time in all groups, however, was devoted to questions raised by Dr. Clapp. That particular approach seemed to be new, even to many Forest Service employees, and of real interest to all.

One question in particular was whether or not resources were essential to democracy, and if so, whether a democracy could afford to do undemocratic things in order to preserve a resource necessary to its existence. This in turn raised the question as to whether the two essential remedies proposed by Dr. Clapp were really and necessarily undemocratic. This applied particularly to the regulation of private property. This was one of the questions not "talked out", but the consensus seemed to be that it was at least bordering on sophistry to say that a people's government could not do anything the people thought best and necessary to preserve their government.

Another way in which the question was stated in another group was, "Will it ever be possible to get the public to accept Government regulation of privately owned forests as not undemocratic? If so, how? If not should arbitrary regulation be enacted?" What seemed to be a majority of opinion was that an arbitrary law should be passed and enforced, and after such regulation has been practiced over a period of time, the public would come to recognize its virtues and accept it as a good idea. To a minority this seemed like begging the question since there is no way in which a law could be passed, even an arbitrary law, except by a majority of the duly elected representatives of the people, and that, at this time, is the prevailing idea of democracy.

The relation of this discussion of arbitrary legislation to Mrs. Roosevelt's contention that the definition of democracy changes, must change, with the changing needs, for the preservation of democracy itself was not brought out in the discussion, yet the whole trend of the school has been toward a broadening of that concept.

The idea of a changing concept of democracy, however, was discussed at another time and in another group. The idea was expressed, although possibly a minority idea, that the reason our ideas of democracy have been so limited in this country is that our abundance of resources has given us a degree of prosperity which has prevented the pressures which force consideration of it; we have just taken for granted that it meant elections, and even election irregularities did not disturb us. We took a lot for granted. But lately the whole idea is receiving a lot of consideration. It seems probable that evolutionary processes are being speeded up and that we will emerge from the present crisis with our definition of democracy considerably broadened and amplified.

Mrs. Roosevelt's reference to her own community provoked considerable discussion from a different angle. Her lack of knowledge about it, particularly her lack of information as to what the government is doing for it, and her reference to people who complained yet continued to vote for the people about whom they complained, received most consideration. The discussion was directed toward the duties, if any, and the possibility of the government employee in the ranks doing anything about such lack of information and participation in National Forest communities.

One discussion on a question not mentioned by any speaker unless it was Dr. Moriam, is included because the conclusion, if correct, seems to be of basic importance to the Department, to the Forest Service, or to any large organization. Further, it seems to conform to the conclusions reached as the result of extended research in a large industrial organization. The question was, "Do people work harder in business or government?" Several who have had experience in private business said they had worked much harder in business. Others said that when they worked in small field offices they had worked far harder than they and others did in large offices. It was concluded that people work harder in small offices where they are closer to the work, where they get inspiration from seeing the results of the work, and where they understand better what they and others are doing.

The industrial organization which arrived at the same conclusion has, we are told, reorganized into smaller work units, with ensuing increase in production.

One other question needs special mention. It was, "Did Dr. Ross mean actually to give the intellectuals extra powers in rule and regulation, as for example extra votes on election? Would the advantages received from their expert knowledge be offset by the loss of the democratic ideal?"

Dr. Ross explained that he did not advocate anything of the kind now, for now we have no way to control it; the wrong men, at least some wrong men, would get the extra power. It was something, possibly for the future, but not for now. We are not ready for it.

Here again comes up the question of the definition of democracy. Would it really be undemocratic to expect the most from those able to give the most? Why?

At first it seemed disappointing that no one proposed a discussion of the real culmination of the whole program -- a life philosophy, -- but after all, probably that was as it should have been. A life philosophy is an intimate, personal thing. And perhaps the school did help some of us in its development.

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
Action: plan of.....	50
recession to.....	44-46, 49, 51
Agriculture, Department of.....	52-55
Anti-Democratic forces.....	59
Aristotle.....	11, 39
Aryan.....	33-34
Attitude of: Congress.....	18-19
government employee.....	18, 20, 22-23, 56
public.....	17
unions.....	20-22
Bryant.....	49
Burr.....	39
Cable.....	45
Chesterson.....	35
Civilization: integrated.....	44
technical.....	40, 58
Courtesy.....	50
Culture.....	71, 72
Democracy: administration in.....	8-12, 57
citizen responsibility in.....	67-69, 70
defense of.....	35-36
definition of.....	66, 74-75
distinguishing note in.....	37
education in.....	66, 67-68, 73
extension of.....	69
important factor in.....	66
intelligence in.....	36-37
limits of.....	41
minority in.....	4-8
participation in.....	4-8, 66, 68, 73, 75
philosophy of.....	70, 73
pressure groups in.....	36
relation to tyranny.....	39
Democratic process.....	66-67
Denominator, lowest common.....	50
Dunbar.....	48
Education.....	66, 67-68, 71, 73
Equality.....	37, 38, 44, 50, 56, 71-72
Fichte.....	33
Forest Lands: abuses.....	61-62
area.....	60
ownership.....	62, 64
problem areas.....	62-63
remedial steps.....	63-64
uses.....	60-61

	<u>Page</u>
Forest Service program.....	63-65
Franklin.....	48
Fraternity.....	44,50,56
Freedom.....	50,56
<u>Fugitive Papers</u>	40
Government activity: expansion of.....	13,17,64,71
individual's part in.....	17,24,71
Hate.....	32-33,56
"Haves" and "have nots".....	25-26
Hegel.....	33
Hitler.....	29,30,33,71
Ideas, surplusage of.....	47
Imagination.....	40,43,56
Ingersoll.....	46
Intellectual specialization.....	40,58
Lenin.....	31
Liberty.....	37,44,50
Manners.....	18,20,28,51
Majority.....	36-37,57,66
Minority.....	4-8,66
Moody.....	49
Mussolini.....	29
National Socialism.....	30
Natural resources.....	14-16,25-26,59,73,74
Nietzsche.....	33
Nordic superiority.....	33,71
Philosophy: definition.....	2
personal.....	57-58,72,75
School of: evaluation of.....	26-27
evolution of.....	3
opening statement of.....	1
opposition to.....	26
purpose of.....	1
subject of.....	1
Point of view.....	41-43
Population pressure.....	13-14,25-26,56
Private initiative: limitation of.....	17,64
regulation and.....	64
Private ownership.....	62,64
Public ownership.....	13,17,64,71
Regulation.....	17,64,74
Republic, definition of.....	36
Russian Revolution.....	31
Smith.....	40
Standard of living.....	18
Stoicism.....	72
Sublimation.....	48,49,56,72
View.....	41

